arXiv:0806.0425v2 [math.SG] 30 Jun 2008

The Conley conjecture for Hamiltonian systems on the cotangent bundle and its analogue for Lagrangian systems

Guangcun Lu [*]
School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University,
Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Ministry of Education,
Beijing 100875, The People's Republic of China
(gclu@bnu.edu.cn)

Revised, 29 June, 2008

Abstract

In this paper, the Conley conjecture, which were recently proved by Franks and Handel [FrHa] (for surfaces of positive genus), Hingston [Hi] (for tori) and Ginzburg [Gi] (for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds), is proved for C^1-Hamiltonian systems on the cotangent bundle of a C^3-smooth compact manifold M without boundary, of a time 1-periodic C^2-smooth Hamiltonian $H:\mathbb{R}\times T^*M\to\mathbb{R}$ which is strongly convex and has quadratic growth on the fibers. Namely, we show that such a Hamiltonian system has an infinite sequence of contractible integral periodic solutions such that any one of them cannot be obtained from others by iterations. If H also satisfies $H(-t,q,-p)=H(t,q,p)$ for any $(t,q,p)\in\mathbb{R}\times T^*M$, it is shown that the time-one map of the Hamiltonian system (if exists) has infinitely many periodic points siting in the zero section of T^*M. If M is C^5-smooth and $\dim M>1$, H is of C^4 class and independent of time t, then for any $\tau>0$ the corresponding system has an infinite sequence of contractible periodic solutions of periods of integral multiple of τ such that any one of them cannot be obtained from others by iterations or rotations. These results are obtained by proving similar results for the Lagrangian system of the Fenchel transform of H, $L:\mathbb{R}\times TM\to\mathbb{R}$, which is proved to be strongly convex and to have quadratic growth in the velocities yet.

---

[*] Partially supported by the NNSF 10671017 of China and the Program for New Century Excellent Talents of the Education Ministry of China.

Contents

1 Introduction and main results **2**

2 Maslov-type indices and Morse index **12**

3 Iteration inequalities of the Morse index **17**

4 Critical modules under iteration maps **23**

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1 **41**

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4 **49**

7 Proof of Theorem 1.6 **51**

8 Questions and remarks **55**

9 Appendix **56**

1 Introduction and main results

Recently, a remarkable progress in Symplectic geometry and Hamiltonian dynamics is that the Conley conjecture [Co, SaZe] were proved by Franks and Handel [FrHa] (for surfaces of positive genus, also see [Le] for generalizations to Hamiltonian homeomorphisms), Hingston [Hi] (for tori) and Ginzburg [Gi] (for closed symplectically aspherical manifolds). See [FrHa, Le, Gi] and references therein for a detailed history and related studies.

In this paper we always assume that M is a n-dimensional, connected C^3-smooth compact manifold without boundary without special statements. For a time 1-periodic C^2-smooth Hamiltonian $H:\mathbb{R}\times T^*M\to\mathbb{R}$, let X_H be the Hamiltonian vector field of H with respect to the standard symplectic structure on T^*M, $\omega_{\rm can}:=-dq\wedge dp$ in local coordinates (q,p) of T^*M, that is, $\omega(X_H(t,q,p),\xi)=-dH(t,q,p)(\xi)\ \forall\xi\in T_{(q,p)}T^*M$. Unlike the case of compact symplectic manifolds we only consider subharmonic solutions of the Hamiltonian equations

$$\dot{x}(t)=X_H(t,x(t)) \tag{1.1}$$

for C^2-smooth Hamiltonians $H:\mathbb{R}\times T^*M\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfying the following conditions (H1)-(H3):

(H1) $H(t+1,q,p)=H(t,q,p)$ for all $(t,q,p)\in\mathbb{R}\times T^*M$.

In any local coordinates $(q_1,\cdots,q_n)$, there exist constants $0<C_1<C_2$, depending on the local coordinates, such that

(H2) $C_1|\mathbf{u}|^2\le\sum_{ij}\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i\partial p_j}(t,q,p)u_iu_j\le C_2|\mathbf{u}|^2\quad\forall\mathbf{u}=(u_1,\cdots,u_n)\in\mathbb{R}^n$,

(H3) $\left|\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right| \le C_2(1+|p|)$, $\left|\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right| \le C_2\Big(1+|p|^2\Big)$.

A class of important examples of such Hamiltonians are Physical Hamiltonian (including 1-periodic potential and electromagnetic forces in time) of the form

$$H(t,q,p) = \frac{1}{2}\|p - A(t,q)\|^2 + V(t,q) \tag{1.2}$$

For C^r-smooth Hamiltonians $H : \mathbb{R} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the conditions (H1)-(H3), $r \ge 2$, by the inequality in the left side of the condition (H2), we can use the inverse Legendre transform to get a fiber-preserving C^{r-1}-diffeomorphism

$$\mathfrak{L}_H : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times TM, \quad (t,q,p) \mapsto (t,q,D_pH(t,q,p))\,, \tag{1.3}$$

and a C^r-smooth function $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} L(t,q,v) &= \max_{p \in T_qM} \{\langle p, v\rangle - H(t,q,p)\} \\ &= \langle p(t,q,v), v\rangle - H(t,q,p(t,q,v)), \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $p = p(t,q,v)$ is a unique point determined by the equality $v = D_pH(t,q,p)$. (See ([Fa, Prop.2.1.6])). By (1.4) we have

(L1) $L(t+1,q,v) = L(t,q,v)$ for all $(t,q,v) \in \mathbb{R} \times TM$.

It is easily checked that the corresponding L with the physical Hamiltonian in (1.2) is given by

$$L(t,q,v) = \frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + \langle A(t,q), v\rangle - V(t,q).$$

In Appendix we shall prove

Proposition A. *Under the condition* (H1)*,* (H2) *is equivalent to the following* (L2) *plus the third inequality in* (L3)*, and* (H2) + (H3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (L2) + (L3)*.*

In any local coordinates $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, there exist constants $0 < c < C$, depending on the local coordinates, such that

(L2) $\sum_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j}(t,q,v)u_iu_j \ge c|\mathbf{u}|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

(L3) $\left|\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,v)\right| \le C(1+|v|^2)$, $\quad \left|\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial v_j}(t,q,v)\right| \le C(1+|v|)$, and $\left|\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j}(t,q,v)\right| \le C$.

(One can also write these two conditions in the free coordinates, see [AbSc, §2].) So Proposition A shows that the conditions (L2)-(L3) have the same properties as (H2)-(H3). (*Note*: we do not claim that the condition (H2) (resp. (H3)) is equivalent to (L2) (resp.(L3)).) By (L2), the Legendre transform produces the inverse of $\mathfrak{L}_H$,

$$\mathfrak{L}_L : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times TM \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times T^*M, \quad (t,q,v) \mapsto (t,q,D_vL(t,q,v))\,, \tag{1.5}$$

and H and L are related by :

$$H(t,q,p) = \langle p, v(t,q,p)\rangle - L(t,q,v(t,q,p)),$$

where $v = v(t, q, p)$ is a unique point determined by the equality $p = D_vL(t, q, v)$. In this case, it is well-known that a curve $\mathbb{R} \to T^*M,\ t \mapsto x(t) = (\gamma(t), \gamma^*(t))$ is a solution of (1.1) if and only if $\gamma^*(t) = D_vL(t, \gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$ and γ is a solution of the Lagrangian system on M:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{q}_i}\Big) - \frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i} = 0 \tag{1.6}$$

in any local coordinates $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$.

Hence we only need to study the existence of infinitely many distinct integer periodic solutions of the system (1.6) under the assumptions (L1)-(L3). To describe our results we introduce the following notations and notions.

For any $T > 0$, each map in $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ represent a homotopy class of free loops in M. As topological spaces $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ and $C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M)$ are always homeomorphic. For a homotopy class α of free loops in M, denote by $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha)$ the subset of maps in $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ representing α. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if we view $\gamma \in C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha)$ as a T-periodic map $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$, it is also viewed as a kT-periodic map from $\mathbb{R}$ to M and thus yields an element of $C(\mathbb{R}/kT\mathbb{Z}, M)$, called the k-th iteration of γ and denoted by γ^k. This $\gamma^k \in C(\mathbb{R}/kT\mathbb{Z}, M)$ represents a free homotopy class in M, denoted by α^k. So $\gamma^k \in C(\mathbb{R}/kT\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k)$. Note also that topological spaces $C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha)$ and $C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha)$ are always homeomorphic yet. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $C^m(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ denote the subset of all C^m-loops $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z} \to M$.

A periodic map $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is called **reversible** (or **even**) if $\gamma(-t) = \gamma(t)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that such a map is always contractible! For $\gamma \in C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ we define rotations of γ via $s \in \mathbb{R}$ as maps $s \cdot \gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ defined by $s \cdot \gamma(t) = \gamma(t + s)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $s \cdot \gamma \in C(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}, M)$ and $(s \cdot \gamma)^m = s \cdot \gamma^m$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We call the set

$$\{\gamma^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \quad \Big(\text{resp. } \{s \cdot \gamma^m\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}\Big)$$

a T-**periodic map tower** (resp. T-**periodic orbit tower**) based on γ (a T-periodic map from $\mathbb{R}$ to M). A T_1-periodic map tower $\{\gamma_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. T_1-periodic orbit tower $\{s\cdot\gamma_1^m\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$) based on a T_1-periodic map $\gamma_1 : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is called **distinct** with $\{\gamma^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $\{s \cdot \gamma^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$) if there is no τ-periodic map $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to M$ such that $\gamma = \beta^p$ and $\gamma_1 = \beta^q$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ (resp. $\gamma = s \cdot \beta^p$ and $\gamma_1 = s' \cdot \beta^q$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s, s' \in \mathbb{R}$). When γ is contractible as a map from $\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z}$ to M, we call the T-periodic map tower $\{\gamma^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. T-periodic orbit tower $\{s \cdot \gamma^m\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$) **contractible**.

For $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is a τ-periodic solution of (1.6), we call the set $\{\gamma^m\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ a τ-**periodic solution tower** of (1.6) based on γ. Two periodic solution towers of (1.6) are said to be **distinct** if they are distinct as periodic map towers. Furthermore, if $s\cdot\gamma$ is also a τ-periodic solution of (1.6) for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, (for example, in the case L is independent of t), we call $\{s \cdot \gamma^m\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ a τ-**periodic solution orbit tower** of (1.6). When two periodic solution orbit towers are distinct as periodic orbit towers we call them **distinct periodic solution orbit towers** of (1.6) based on γ. Clearly, the existence of infinitely many distinct integer periodic solution towers (resp. solution orbit towers) of (1.6) implies that there exist an infinite sequence of integer periodic solutions of (1.6) such that each of them cannot be obtained from others by iterations (resp. iterations or rotations). The following is the first main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.1 *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L3). Then:*

(i) *Suppose that for a homotopy class α of free loops in M and an abelian group $\mathbb{K}$ the singular homology groups $H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k); \mathbb{K})$ have nonzero ranks for some integer $r \geq n$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then* `either` *for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist infinitely many distinct l-periodic solutions of (1.6) representing α^l,* `or` *there exist infinitely many positive integers $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the system (1.6) has a periodic solution with minimal period l_i and representing α^{l_i}.*

(ii) *Suppose that for some abelian group $\mathbb{K}$ and integer $r \geq n$ the singular homology groups $H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M); \mathbb{K})$ have nonzero ranks. Then* `either` *for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist infinitely many distinct l-periodic solutions of (1.6),* `or` *there exist infinitely many positive integers $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the system (1.6) has a periodic solution with minimal period l_i.*

Let 0 denote the free homotopy class of contractible loops in M, i.e., $C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; 0)$ consists of all contractible loops $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to M$. The obvious inclusion $\imath : M \to C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; 0)$ and the evaluation

$$\mathrm{EV} : C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; 0) \to M, \ \gamma \mapsto \gamma(0)$$

satisfy $\mathrm{EV} \circ \imath = id_M$. It easily follows that

$$\imath_* : H_k(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \to H_k\big(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; 0); \mathbb{Z}_2\big)$$

is injective for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $H_n(M, \mathbb{Z}_2) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ for $n = \dim M$, we get

$$\mathrm{rank} H_n\big(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; 0); \mathbb{Z}_2\big) \neq 0. \tag{1.7}$$

Corollary 1.2 *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L3). Then the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many distinct* contractible *integer periodic solution towers.*

Remark 1.3 1° When M has finite fundamental group, Benci [Be] first proved that the system (1.6) has infinitely many distinct contractible 1-periodic solutions for C^2-smooth Lagrangian L satisfying the conditions (L1)-(L3) and

$$\Big|\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}(t, q, v)\Big| \leq C(1 + |v|^2), \quad \Big|\frac{\partial L}{\partial v_i} L(t, q, v)\Big| \leq C(1 + |v|)$$

in some local coordinates $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$ for some constant $C > 0$. Recently, under weaker assumptions than (L1)-(L3), i.e. Tonelli conditions and (L5) below, Abbondandolo and Figalli [AbF, Cor.3.2] showed that the system (1.6) has an infinite sequence of 1-periodic contractible solutions with diverging action and diverging Morse index. The key in [Be, AbF] is the fact that the space of free loops in a compact simply connected manifold has infinitely many nonzero (co)homology groups with real coefficients [Su]. A new technique in [AbF] is to modify their Tonelli Lagrangian L to one satisfying (L1)-(L3).

2° On n-dimensional torus T^n, for the Lagrangian of the form

$$L(t,q,v)=\frac{1}{2}g_q(v,v)+U(t,q) \tag{1.8}$$

for all $(t,q,v)\in\mathbb{R}\times TT^n=\mathbb{R}\times T^n\times\mathbb{R}^n$, where g is a C^3-smooth Riemannian metric on T^n and $U\in C^3(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\times T^n,\mathbb{R})$, (such a L satisfies the conditions (L1)-(L3)), Yiming Long [Lo2] proved that the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many distinct contractible integer periodic solution towers.

We refer the reader to [Lo2] and the references given there for the detailed history on the integer periodic solutions of the Lagrangian system.

If $L:\mathbb{R}\times TM\to\mathbb{R}$ also satisfies

(L4) $L(-t,q,-v)=L(t,q,v)$ for any $(t,q,v)\in\mathbb{R}\times TM$,

we can improve Corollary 1.2 as follows.

Theorem 1.4 *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $L:\mathbb{R}\times TM\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L4). Then the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many distinct contractible integer periodic solution towers based on* `reversible` *periodic solutions.*

This result was proved by the author and Mingyan Wang [LuW2] in the case that $M=T^n$ and that L has the form (1.8) and satisfies (L4), i.e. $U(-t,q)=U(t,q)$ for any $(t,q)\in\mathbb{R}\times T^n$. In particular, we have a generalization of [LuW2, Th.1.6].

Corollary 1.5 *If $L\in C^2(TM,\mathbb{R})$ satisfies (L2)-(L4), then for any real number $\tau>0$, the following three claims have at least one to be true:*

- *L has infinitely many critical points sitting in $M=0_{TM}$ and thus the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many different constant solutions in M;*
- *there exists some positive integer k such that the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many different nonconstant $k\tau$-periodic solution orbit towers based on* `reversible` *periodic solutions of (1.6);*
- *there exist infinitely many positive integers $k_1<k_2<\cdots$, such that for each k_m the system (1.6) possesses a* `reversible` *periodic solution with minimal period $k_m\tau$, $m=1,2,\cdots$.*

When $M=T^n$ and L has the form (1.8) with real analytic g and nonconstant, autonomous and real analytic U, the author and Mingyan Wang [LuW1] observed that suitably improving the arguments in [CaTa] can give a simple proof of Corollary 1.5. It should also be noted that even if M is simply connected the methods in [Be, AbF] cannot produce infinitely many reversible integer periodic solutions because the space of reversible loops in M can contract to the zero section of TM and therefore has no infinitely many nonzero Betti numbers.

If $L \in C^2(TM, \mathbb{R})$ only satisfies (L2)-(L3), it is possible that two distinct solutions γ_1 and γ_2 obtained by Theorem 1.1 only differ a rotation, i.e., $\gamma_1(t) = \gamma_2(s+t)$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. However, we can combine the proof of Theorem 1.1 with the method in [LoLu] to improve the results in Theorem 1.1 as follows:

Theorem 1.6 *Let M be a C^5-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^4-smooth map $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L2)-(L3). Then for any $\tau > 0$ the following results hold:*

- **(i)** *Suppose that for a homotopy class α of free loops in M and an abelian group $\mathbb{K}$ the singular homology groups $H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k); \mathbb{K})$ have nonzero ranks for some integer $r \ge n$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If either $r \ge n+1$ or $r = n > 1$, then* `either` *for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist infinitely many distinct periodic solution orbit towers based on $l\tau$-periodic solutions of (1.6) representing α^l,* `or` *there exist infinitely many positive integers $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the system (1.6) has a periodic solution orbit tower based on a periodic solution with minimal period $l_i\tau$ and representing α^{l_i}.*
- **(ii)** *Suppose that the singular homology groups $H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M); \mathbb{K})$ have nonzero ranks for some integer $r \ge n$ and some abelian group $\mathbb{K}$. If either $r \ge n+1$ or $r = n > 1$, then* `either` *for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist infinitely many distinct periodic solution orbit towers based on $l\tau$-periodic solutions of (1.6),* `or` *there exist infinitely many positive integers $l_1 < l_2 < \cdots$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the system (1.6) has a periodic solution orbit tower based on a periodic solution with minimal period $l_i\tau$.*

By (1.7) we immediately get:

Corollary 1.7 *Let M be a C^5-smooth compact manifold of dimension $n > 1$ and without boundary, and C^4-smooth map $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L2)-(L3). Then for any $\tau > 0$ the system (1.6) possesses infinitely many distinct periodic solution orbit towers based on* `contractible` *periodic solutions of integer multiple periods of τ.*

Clearly, when (L4) is satisfied Corollary 1.5 seems to be stronger than Corollary 1.7. If $n = 1$ and (L4) is not satisfied, we do not know whether Corollary 1.7 is still true. Moreover, the reason that we require higher smoothness in Theorem 1.6 and Corollary 1.7 is to assure that the normal bundle of a nonconstant periodic orbit is C^2-smooth.

When $M = T^n$ and L has the form (1.8) with flat g and autonomous U, Yiming Long and the author [LoLu] developed the equivariant version of the arguments in [Lo2] to prove Corollary 1.7. Even if g is not flat, the author and Mingyan Wang [LuW2, Th.1.6] also derived a stronger result than Corollary 1.7 in the case that $M = T^n$. Campos and Tarallo [CaTa] obtained a similar result provided that the metric g is real analytic, and that the potential U is autonomous, real analytic and nonconstant.

Even if $L = \frac{1}{2}g$ for a C^4-Riemannian metric g on M, it seems that Theorem 1.6 or Corollary 1.7 cannot yield infinitely many geometrically distinct closed geodesics.

Assume that L also satisfies

(L5) For any $(q, v) \in TM$ there exists an unique solution of (1.6), $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$, such that $(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0)) = (q, v)$.

By [AbF, §2], this assumption can be satisfied if

$$-\partial_t L(t, q, v) \le c\,(1 + D_v L(t, q, v)[v] - L(t, q, v)) \quad \forall (t, q, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times TM. \tag{1.9}$$

(Clearly, the left side may be replaced by $const - \partial_t L(t, q, v)$ since (L5) is also satisfied up to adding a constant to L. Moreover, that L satisfies (L1)-(L3) is equivalent to that the Fenchel transform H of L given by (1.4) satisfies the assumptions (H1)-(H3) below. In this case (1.9) is equivalent to (1.11) below. Hence (1.9) holds if L is independent of t as noted below (1.11).) Under the assumption (L5), we have an one-parameter family of C^1-diffeomorphisms $\Phi_L^t \in \mathrm{Diff}(TM)$ satisfying $\Phi_L^t(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0)) = (\gamma(t), \dot{\gamma}(t))$. (See [Fa, Th.2.6.5]). Following [Lo2], the time-1-map $\Phi_L = \Phi_L^1$ is called the **Poincaré map** of the system (1.6) corresponding to the Lagrangian function L. Every integer periodic solution γ of (1.6) gives a periodic point $(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0))$ of Φ_L. If γ is even, then the periodic point $(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0))$ sits in the zero section 0_{TM} of TM. So Corollary 1.2 and Theorem 1.4 yield the following

Corollary 1.8 *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $L : \mathbb{R} \times TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L3) and (L5). Then the Poincaré map Φ_L has infinitely many distinct periodic points. Furthermore, if (L4) is also satisfied then the Poincaré map Φ_L has infinitely many distinct periodic points sitting in the zero section 0_{TM} of TM.*

If L is independent of t, for a periodic point $(\gamma(0), \dot{\gamma}(0))$ of Φ_L generated by a τ-periodic solution γ, then all points of $\{(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) \,|\, s \in \mathbb{R}\}$ are periodic points of Φ_L. We call such period points **orbitally same**. By remarks below (1.9), using Corollary 1.7 we can improve Corollary 1.8 as follows:

Corollary 1.9 *Let M be a C^5-smooth compact manifold of dimension $n > 1$ and without boundary, and C^4-smooth map $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (L2)-(L3). Then the Poincaré map Φ_L has infinitely many* `orbitally distinct` *periodic points.*

It is easily checked that the assumption (L4) is equivalent to the following:

(H4) $H(-t, q, -p) = H(t, q, p)$ for any $(t, q, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*M$.

In this case, $v = v(t, q, p)$ uniquely determined by the equality $p = D_v L(t, q, v)$ satisfies

$$v(-t, q, -p) = -v(t, q, p) \quad \forall (t, q, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*M. \tag{1.10}$$

So if a solution $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ of (1.6) satisfies $\gamma(-t) = \gamma(t)$ $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\gamma^*(-t) = -\gamma^*(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

With the same way as the definition of solution towers and solution orbit towers to (1.6) we can define solution towers to (1.1), and solution orbit towers to (1.1) in the case H is independent of t. Then the Hamiltonian versions from Theorem 1.1 to Corollary 1.7 can be obtained immediately. For example, from Corollary 1.2, Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.7 we directly derive:

Theorem 1.10 1°) *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $H : \mathbb{R} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (H1)-(H3). Then the system (1.1) possesses infinitely many distinct* contractible *integer periodic solution towers. Furthermore, if (H4) is also satisfied then the system (1.1) possesses infinitely many distinct contractible integer periodic solution towers based on periodic solutions with* `reversible` *projections to M.*
2°) *Let M be a C^5-smooth compact manifold of dimension $n > 1$ and without boundary, and C^4-smooth map $H : \mathbb{R} \times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (H2)-(H3). Then for any $\tau > 0$ the system (1.1) has infinitely many distinct periodic solution orbit towers based on* `contractible` *periodic solutions of integer multiple periods of τ.*

Remark 1.11 If $\pi_1(M)$ is finite, Cieliebak [Ci] showed that the system (1.1) has infinitely many contractible 1-periodic solutions (with unbounded actions) provided that $H \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times T^*M, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies

(HC1) $dH(t,q,p)\left[p\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\right] - H(t,q,p) \ge h_0\|p\|^2 - h_1$,

(HC2) $\left|\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right| \le d$ and $\left|\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right| \le d$,

for all $(t,q,p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*M$, with respect to a suitable metric on the bundle $T^*M \to M$ and constants $h_0 > 0, h_1$ and d. Here $q_1, \cdots, q_n, p_1, \cdots, p_n$ are coordinates on T^*M induced by geodesic normal coordinates $q_1, \cdots, q_n$ on M.
Recently, Abbondandolo and Figalli stated in [AbF, Remark 7.4] that the same result can be derived from [AbF, Th.7.3] if the assumptions (HC1)-(HC2) are replaced by

(HAF1) $dH(t,q,p)\left[p\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\right] - H(t,q,p) \ge a(|p|_q)$ for some function $a : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{s\to+\infty} a(s) = +\infty$,

(HAF2) $H(t,q,p) \ge h(|p|_q)$ for some function $h : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim_{s\to+\infty} \frac{h(s)}{s} = +\infty$ and all $(t,q,p) \in \mathbb{R} \times T^*M$,

and (H5) below. Note that no convexity assumption on H was made in [Ci, AbF] and therefore that their results cannot be obtained from one on Lagrangian system via the Legendre transform.

It is easily seen that the assumption (L5) is equivalent to the following:

(H5) For any $(q,p) \in T^*M$ there exists an unique solution of $\dot{x}(t) = X_H(t, x(t))$, $x : \mathbb{R} \to M$, such that $x(0) = (q,p)$.

The assumption can be satisfied under the following equivalent condition of (1.9):

$$\partial_t H(t,q,p) \le c\,(1+H(t,q,p)) \quad \forall (t,q,p)\in\mathbb{R}\times T^*M, \tag{1.11}$$

see [AbF, pp.629]. Since (H2) implies that H is superlinear on the fibers of T^*M, (1.11) holds clearly if H is independent of time t. The condition (H5) guarantees that the global flow of X_H exists on T^*M. Thus we have an one-parameter family of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms $\Psi^H_t \in \mathrm{Ham}(T^*M,\omega_{\mathrm{can}})$ satisfying $\Psi^H_t(\gamma(0),\dot\gamma^*(0)) = (\gamma(t),\dot\gamma^*(t))$. As usual, the time-1-map $\Psi^H=\Psi^H_1$ is called the **Poincaré map** of the system (1.1) corresponding to the Hamiltonian function H. For each $t\in\mathbb{R}$ recall that the Legendre transform associated with $L_t(\cdot)=L(t,\cdot)$ is given by

$$\mathfrak{L}_{L_t}: TM\to T^*M, \quad (q,v)\mapsto (q, D_vL(t,q,v)).$$

It is easy to check that

$$\Psi^H_t\circ\mathfrak{L}_{L_0} = \mathfrak{L}_{L_t}\circ\Phi^t_L \quad \text{for any } t\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.12}$$

From this one immediately gets the following equivalent Hamiltonian versions of Corollary 1.8 and Corollary 1.9.

Theorem 1.12 1°) *Let M be a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold without boundary, and C^2-smooth map $H:\mathbb{R}\times T^*M\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (H1)-(H3) and (H5). Then the Poincaré map Ψ^H has infinitely many distinct periodic points. Furthermore, if (H4) is also satisfied then the Poincaré map Ψ^H has infinitely many distinct periodic points sitting in the zero section 0_{T^*M} of T^*M.*
2°) *Let M be a C^5-smooth compact manifold of dimension $n>1$ and without boundary, and C^4-smooth map $H:\mathbb{R}\times T^*M\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the conditions (H2)-(H3). Then the Poincaré map Ψ^H has infinitely many orbitally distinct periodic points. (That is, any two do not sit the same Hamiltonian orbit.)*

Theorems 1.10, 1.12 may be viewed a solution for the Conley conjecture for Hamiltonian systems on cotangent bundles, and Corollary 1.8 and Corollary 1.9 may be viewed as confirm answers of Lagrangian systems analogue of the Conley conjecture for Hamiltonian systems.

The main proof ideas come from [Lo2]. We shall prove Theorems 1.1, 1.6 in the case $r=n$, and Theorem 1.4 by generalizing the variational arguments in [Lo2], [LoLu] and [LuW2] respectively. Some new ideas are needed because we do not lift to the universal cover space of M as done in [Lo2, LoLu, LuW2] for the tori case. We also avoid using finite energy homologies used in [Lo2, LoLu, LuW2]. Let us outline the variational setup and new ideas as follows. For $\tau>0$, let

$$S_\tau := \mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z} = \{[s]_\tau \,|\, [s]_\tau = s+\tau\mathbb{Z},\, s\in\mathbb{R}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_\tau = W^{1,2}(S_\tau, M)$$

denote the space of all loops $\gamma: S_\tau\to M$ of Sobolev class $W^{1,2}$. For a homotopy class α of free loops in M, let

$$H_\tau(\alpha), \quad H_\tau = H_\tau(0), \quad EH_\tau$$

respectively denote the subset of loops of E_τ representing α, that of all contractible loops in E_τ, and that of all reversible loops in E_τ. Then $EH_\tau \subset H_\tau$.

For integer $m \geq 2$, if M is C^m-smooth, all these spaces E_τ, $H_\tau(\alpha)$ and EH_τ have C^{m-1}-smooth Hilbert manifold structure [Kl], and the tangent space of E_τ at γ is $T_\gamma E_\tau = W^{1,2}(\gamma^*TM)$. Moreover, any ($C^{m-1}$) Riemannian metric $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ on M induces a complete Riemannian metric on E_τ:

$$\langle\langle\xi,\eta\rangle\rangle_\tau = \int_0^\tau \left(\langle\xi(t),\eta(t)\rangle_{\gamma(t)} + \langle\nabla_t\xi(t),\nabla_t\eta(t)\rangle_{\gamma(t)}\right) dt \qquad (1.13)$$
$$\forall\gamma \in E_\tau,\ \xi,\eta \in T_\gamma E_\tau = W^{1,2}(\gamma^*TM).$$

Here ∇_t denotes the covariant derivative in direction $\dot\gamma$ with respect to the Levi-Civita connection ∇ of $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$. Let $\|\xi\|_\tau = \sqrt{\langle\langle\xi,\xi\rangle\rangle_\tau}\quad \forall\xi \in T_\gamma E_\tau$. Then the distance on E_τ induced by $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ is *complete* and also *compatible* with the manifold topology on E_τ. Consider the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau : E_\tau \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma) = \int_0^\tau L(t,\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))dt \quad \forall\gamma \in E_\tau. \qquad (1.14)$$

For integer $m \geq 3$, if M is C^m-smooth and C^{m-1}-smooth $L : \mathbb{R}\times TM \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the assumptions (L1)-(L3), then the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ is C^2-smooth, bounded below, satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, and all critical points of it have finite Morse indexes and nullities, (see [AbF, Prop.4.1, 4.2] and [Be]). By [Fa, Th.3.7.2], all critical points of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ are all of class C^{m-1} and therefore correspond to all τ-periodic solutions of (1.6).

Let $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on EH_τ. When L satisfies (L4), it is not hard to prove that a map $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is a τ-periodic even solution to (1.6) if and only if γ is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ on EH_τ, cf. [LuW2, Lem.1.7].

When we attempt to prove Theorem 1.1 by the method of [Lo2], we first need to know how to relate the Morse index and nullity of a critical point $\gamma \in E_\tau$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ to those of the k-th iteration $\gamma^k \in E_{k\tau}$ as a critical point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $E_{k\tau}$. Since we do not assume that M is orientable or γ is contractible, the bundle $\gamma^*TM \to S_\tau$ might not be trivial. However, for the 2-th iteration γ^2, the pullback bundle $(\gamma^2)^*TM \to S_{2\tau}$ is always trivial. Since our proof is indirect by assuming that the conclusion does not hold, the arguments can be reduced to the case that all τ-periodic solutions have trivial pullback bundles (as above Lemma 5.2). For such periodic solutions we can choose suitably coordinate charts around them on $E_{k\tau}$ so that the question is reduced to the case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ as in Lemma 3.2. Hence we can get expected iteration inequalities as in Theorem 3.1. The second new idea is that under the assumption each $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ has only isolated critical points we show in Lemma 5.2 how to use an elementary arguments as above Corollary 1.2 and the Morse theory to get a non-minimal saddle point with nonzero th-n critical module with $\mathbb{Z}_2$-coefficient; the original method in [Lo2, Lemma 4.1] is to use Lemma II.5.2 on the page 127 of [Ch] to arrive at this goal, which seems to be difficult for me generalizing it to manifolds. It is worth noting that we avoid using finite energy homologies used in [Lo2, LoLu, LuW2]. That is based on an observation, that is, the composition $(j_{k\tau})_* \circ \psi^k_*$ in (5.13) has a good decomposition $(\mathbf{J}_k)_*\circ(\psi^k)_*\circ(\mathbf{I}_1)_*$ as in (5.15) such that for each $\omega\in C_n(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\gamma;\mathbb{K})$, $(\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega)$ is a singular homology class of a C^1-Hilbert manifold and hence has a C^1-singular cycle representative. It is the final claim that allows us to use the singular homology to complete the remained arguments in Long'method of [Lo2]. A merit of this improvement is to reduce the smoothness of the Largangian L. That is, we only need to assume that L is of class C^2. However, a new problem occurs, i.e. $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}$ in (4.12) is only a homeomorphism. It is very fortunate that $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ is also of class C^2 as noted at the end of proof of Theorem 5.1 (the generalized Morse lemma) on the page 44 of [Ch]. Using the image of Gromoll-Meyer of $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}(\eta)+\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}(\xi)$ under $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}$, called topological Gromoll-Meyer, to replace a Gromoll-Meyer of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $\tilde{\gamma}^k$, we construct topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\gamma\in H_\tau(\alpha)$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\gamma^k\in H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, to satisfy Theorem 4.4 which is enough to complete our proof of Theorem 1.1. For the proof of Theorem 1.6 we need to complete more complex arguments as in §4.3. But the ideas are similar.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 will review some basic facts concerning the Maslov-type indices and relations between them and Morse indexes. In Section 3 we give some iteration inequalities of the Morse indexes. Section 4 studies changes of the critical modules under iteration maps. In Sections 5, 6 and 7, we give the proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.4 and 1.6 respectively. Motivated by the second claim in Theorem 1.10 1°), a more general question than the Conley's conjecture and a program in progress are proposed in Section 8. In Appendix of Section 9 we prove Proposition A and a key Lemma A.4, which is a generalization of [Lo2, Lemma 2.3].

Acknowledgements: I am greatly indebted to Professor Yiming Long for leading me this to question ten years ago. The author sincerely thanks Professors Le Calvez and C. Viterbo for organizing a seminar of symplectic dynamics at Beijing International Mathematics Center in May 2007, where my interest for this question was aroused again. He also sincerely thanks Professor Alberto Abbondandolo for some helps in understanding his paper. The results and outlines of proofs in this paper were reported in the workshop on Floer Theory and Symplectic Dynamics at CRM of University of Montreal, May 19-23, 2008. I would like to thank the organizers for their invitation, and CRM for hospitality. Finally, I sincerely thank Professor Kung-Ching Chang for his helps in correcting mistakes in the first draft.

2 Maslov-type indices and Morse index

2.1. A review on Maslov-type indices. Let $\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R})=\{M\in\mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}\,|\,M^TJ_0M=J_0\}$, where $J_0=\begin{pmatrix}0 & -I_n\\ I_n & 0\end{pmatrix}$. For $\tau>0$, denoted by

$$\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)=\{\Psi\in C([0,\tau],\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R}))\,|\,\Psi(0)=I_{2n}\},$$
$$\mathcal{P}^*_\tau(2n)=\{\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)\,|\,\det(\Psi(\tau)-I_{2n})\neq 0\}.$$

The paths in $\mathcal{P}^*_\tau(2n)$ are called **nondegenerate**. The Maslov-type index (or Conley-Zehnder index) theory for the paths in $\mathcal{P}^*_\tau(2n)$ was defined by [CoZe], [Lo1] and [Vi2].

Yiming Long [Lo4] extended this theory to all paths in $\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$. The Maslov-type index of a path $\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ is a pair of integers $(i_\tau(\Psi),\nu_\tau(\Psi))$, where

$$\begin{aligned}&\nu_\tau(\Psi)=\dim_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{Ker}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Psi(\tau)-I_{2n})\quad\text{and}\\ &i_\tau(\Psi)=\inf\{i_\tau(\beta)\,|\,\beta\in\mathcal{P}^*_\tau(2n)\text{ is sufficiently }C^0\text{ close to }\Psi\text{ in }\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)\}\end{aligned}$$

with $i_\tau(\beta)$ defined as in [CoZe]. Clearly, the map $i_\tau:\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)\to\mathbb{Z}$ is lower semi-continuous. For any paths $\Psi_k\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, $k=0,1$, $(i_\tau(\Psi_0),\nu_\tau(\Psi_0))=(i_\tau(\Psi_1),\nu_\tau(\Psi_1))$ if and only if there exists a homotopy $\Psi_s, 0\le s\le 1$ from Ψ_0 to Ψ_1 in $\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ such that $\Psi_s(0)=I_{2n}$ and $\nu_\tau(\Psi_s(\tau))\equiv\nu_\tau(\Psi_0)$ for any $s\in[0,1]$.

For $a<b$ and any path $\Psi\in C([a,b],\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R}))$, choose $\beta\in\mathcal{P}_1(2n)$ with $\beta(1)=\Psi(a)$, and define $\phi\in\mathcal{P}_1(2n)$ by $\phi(t)=\beta(2t)$ for $0\le t\le 1/2$, and

$$\phi(t)=\Psi(a+(2t-1)(b-a))\quad\text{for}\quad 1/2\le t\le 1.$$

It was showed in [Lo4] that the difference $i_1(\phi)-i_1(\beta)$ only depends on Ψ, and was called the **Maslov-type index** of Ψ , denoted by

$$i(\Psi,[a,b]):=i_1(\phi)-i_1(\beta).\tag{2.1}$$

Clearly, $i(\Psi,[0,1])=i_1(\Psi)$ for any $\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_1(2n)$.

Let $(F,\{\cdot,\cdot\})$ be the symplectic space with $F=\mathbb{R}^{2n}\oplus\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and

$$\{u,v\}=\langle\mathcal{J}u,v\rangle\quad\forall u,v\in F,\quad\text{where }\mathcal{J}=\begin{pmatrix}-J_0&0\\0&J_0\end{pmatrix}.$$

All vectors are understand as column vectors in this paper without special statements. Let $\mathrm{Lag}(F)$ be the manifold of Lagrangian Grassmannian of $(F,\{\cdot,\cdot\})$, and μ^{CLM} be the Cappell-Lee-Miller index characterized by properties I-VI of [CLM, pp. 127-128]. There exists the following relation between μ^{CLM} and the index defined by (2.1),

$$i(\Psi,[a,b])=\mu_F^{\mathrm{CLM}}(W,\mathrm{Gr}\,(\Psi),[a,b])-n,\tag{2.2}$$

where $W=\{(x^T,x^T)^T\in\mathbb{R}^{4n}\,|\,x\in\mathbb{R}^{2n}\}$.

With $U_1=\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}^n$ and $U_2=\mathbb{R}^n\times\{0\}$, two new Maslov-type indices for any path $\Psi\in C([a,b],\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R}))$ were defined in [LoZZ] as follows:

$$\mu_k(\Psi,[a,b])=\mu^{\mathrm{CLM}}_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}(U_k,\Psi U_k,[a,b]),\ k=1,2.\tag{2.3}$$

Let $\Psi(b)=\begin{pmatrix}A&B\\C&D\end{pmatrix}$, where $A,B,C,D\in\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. In terms of [LoZZ, (2.21)], define

$$\nu_1(\Psi,[a,b])=\dim\mathrm{Ker}(B)\quad\text{and}\quad\nu_2(\Psi,[a,b])=\dim\mathrm{Ker}(C).\tag{2.4}$$

In particular, for $\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ and $k=1,2$ we denote by

$$\mu_{k,\tau}(\Psi)=\mu_k(\Psi,[0,\frac{\tau}{2}])\quad\text{and}\quad\nu_{k,\tau}(\Psi)=\nu_k(\Psi,[0,\frac{\tau}{2}]).\tag{2.5}$$

Assumption B. (B1) Let $B \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n})$ be a path of symmetric matrix which is τ-periodic in time t, i.e., $B(t+\tau) = B(t)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
(B2) Let $B(t) = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11}(t) & B_{12}(t) \\ B_{21}(t) & B_{22}(t) \end{pmatrix}$, where $B_{11}, B_{22},\ t \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are `even` at $t = 0$ and $\tau/2$, and $B_{12}, B_{21},\ t \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ are `odd` at $t = 0$ and $\tau/2$.

Under the assumption (B1), let Ψ be the fundamental solution of the problem

$$\dot{\Psi}(t) = J_0 B(t)\Psi(t), \quad \Psi(0) = I_{2n}. \tag{2.6}$$

By the classical Floquet theory, $\nu_\tau(\Psi)$ is the dimension of the solution space of the linear Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = J_0 B(t)\mathbf{u}(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}(t+\tau) = \mathbf{u}(t).$$

Similarly, under the assumptions (B1) and (B2), it was also shown in [LoZZ, Prop.1.3]) that $\nu_{1,\tau}(\Psi)$ and $\nu_{2,\tau}(\Psi)$ are the dimensions of the solution spaces of the following two problems respectively,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = J_0 B(t)\mathbf{u}(t), \\ \mathbf{u}(t+\tau) = \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \mathbf{u}(-t) = N\mathbf{u}(t), \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = J_0 B(t)\mathbf{u}(t), \\ \mathbf{u}(t+\tau) = \mathbf{u}(t), \quad \mathbf{u}(-t) = -N\mathbf{u}(t), \end{cases}$$

where $N = \begin{pmatrix} -I_n & 0 \\ 0 & I_n \end{pmatrix}$. Let $(x_1, \cdots, x_n, y_1, \cdots, y_n)$ denote the coordinates in $\mathbb{R}^{2n} = \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Denote by $\omega_0 = \sum_{k=1}^n dx_k \wedge dy_k$ the standard symplectic structure on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, i.e. $\omega_0(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \langle J_0\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\rangle\ \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Define $H : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $H(t, \mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}\langle B(t)\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}\rangle$. Let X_H be the corresponding Hamiltonian vector field defined by

$$\omega_0(X_H(t, \mathbf{u}), \mathbf{v}) = -d_{\mathbf{u}} H(t, \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{v}). \tag{2.7}$$

Then $X_H(t, \mathbf{u}) = J_0 B(t)\mathbf{u}$ for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

For $\Psi \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$, extend the definition of Ψ to $[0, +\infty)$ by

$$\Psi(t) = \Psi(t - j\tau)\Psi(\tau)^j, \quad \forall j\tau \le t \le (j+1)\tau,\ j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{2.8}$$

and define the m-th iteration Ψ^m of Ψ by

$$\Psi^m = \Psi|_{[0, m\tau]}. \tag{2.9}$$

It was proved in [Lo3, pp. 177-178] that the mean index per τ of $\Psi \in \mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$,

$$\hat{i}_\tau(\Psi) := \lim_{m\to+\infty} \frac{i_{m\tau}(\Psi^m)}{m} \tag{2.10}$$

always exists.

Lemma 2.1 (i) *For any* $\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ *it holds that*

$$\max\Big\{0, m\hat{i}_\tau(\Psi)-n\Big\}\le i_{m\tau}(\Psi^m)\le m\hat{i}_\tau(\Psi)+n-\nu_{m\tau}(\Psi^m),\quad \forall m\in\mathbb{N}.$$

(ii) $|\mu_1(\Psi)-\mu_2(\Psi)|\le n$ *for any* $\Psi\in\mathcal{P}_\tau(2n)$ *with* $\tau>0$.
(iii) *Under Assumption B, let* $\Psi:[0,+\infty)\to\mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R})$ *be the fundamental solution of the problem (2.6). (It must satisfy (2.8)). Then*

$$\mu_{1,m\tau}\left(\Psi|_{[0,\frac{m\tau}{2}]}\right)+\mu_{2,m\tau}\left(\Psi|_{[0,\frac{m\tau}{2}]}\right)=i_{m\tau}\left(\Psi|_{[0,m\tau]}\right)+n\quad\forall m\in\mathbb{N},\tag{2.11}$$

(or equivaliently $\mu_1(\Psi,[0,m\tau])+\mu_2(\Psi,[0,m\tau])=i_{m\tau}\left(\Psi|_{[0,m\tau]}\right)+n\ \forall m\in\mathbb{N}$*). Moreover, for* $k=1,2$ *the mean indices of* Ψ *per* τ *defined by*

$$\hat{\mu}_{k,\tau}(\Psi):=\lim_{m\to+\infty}\frac{\mu_{k,m\tau}\left(\Psi|_{[0,m\tau]}\right)}{m}\tag{2.12}$$

always exist and equal to $\frac{1}{2}\hat{i}_\tau(\Psi)$.

(i) comes from [LiLo] or [Lo3, p. 213, (17)], (ii) is [LoZZ, Th.3.3], and (iii) is [LoZZ, Prop.C, Cor.6.2] (precisely is derived from the proof of [LoZZ, Prop.C, Cor.6.2]). It is easily checked that (i) implies $|i_{m\tau}-mi_\tau|\le(m+1)n$ for any $m\in\mathbb{N}$. A similar inequality to the latter was also derived in [DDP, (12)] recently.

2.2. Relations between Maslov-type indices and Morse indices.

Lemma 2.2 ([Vi1, LoAn]). *Let the Lagrangian* $L:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^{2n}\to\mathbb{R}$ *be given by*

$$L(t,y,v)=\frac{1}{2}P(t)v\cdot v+Q(t)y\cdot v+\frac{1}{2}R(t)y\cdot y,$$

where $P,Q,R:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ *are* C^1*-smooth and* τ*-periodic,* $R(t)=R(t)^T$*, and each* $P(t)=P(t)^T$ *is also positive definite. The corresponding Lagrangian system is*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(t,y,\dot{y})\Big)-\frac{\partial L}{\partial y}(t,y,\dot{y})=(P\dot{y}+Qy)^{\cdot}-Q^T\dot{y}-Ry=0.\tag{2.13}$$

Let $\tilde{y}$ *be a critical point of the functional*

$$f_\tau(y)=\int_0^\tau L(t,y(t),\dot{y}(t))dt$$

on $W^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)$*, and the second differential of* f_τ *at it be given by*

$$d^2f_\tau(\tilde{y})(y,z)=\int_0^\tau\left[(P\dot{y}+Qy)\cdot\dot{z}+Q^T\dot{y}\cdot z+Ry\cdot z\right]dt.$$

The linearized system of (2.13) at $\tilde{y}$ *is the Sturm system:*

$$-(P\dot{y}+Qy)^{\cdot}+Q^T\dot{y}+Ry=0.$$

Let

$$S(t)=\begin{pmatrix}P(t)^{-1} & -P(t)^{-1}Q(t)\\ -Q(t)^TP(t)^{-1} & Q(t)^TP(t)^{-1}Q(t)-R(t)\end{pmatrix},\tag{2.14}$$

and $\Psi : [0, +\infty) \to \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ *be the fundamental solution of the problem*

$$\dot{\mathbf{u}}(t) = J_0 S(t)\mathbf{u} \tag{2.15}$$

with $\Psi(0) = I_{2n}$*. Suppose that each* $P(t)$ *is symmetric positive definite, and that each* $R(t)$ *is symmetric. Then* f_τ *at* $\tilde{y} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ *has finite* `Morse index` $m_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y})$ *and* `nullity` $m^0_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y})$*, and*

$$m^-_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y}) = i_\tau(\Psi) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y}) = \nu_\tau(\Psi). \tag{2.16}$$

Remark 2.3 Since $L_{vv}(t, y, v) = P(t)$ is invertible for every t, L has the Legendre transform $H : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$H(t, x, y) = x \cdot v(t, x, y) - L(t, x, v(t, x, y)),$$

where $v(t, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is determined by $L_v(t, y, v(t, x, y)) = x$. Precisely, $v(t, x, y) = P(t)^{-1}[x - Q(t)y]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, x, y) &= \frac{1}{2}P(t)^{-1}x \cdot x - P(t)^{-1}x \cdot Q(t)y \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}P(t)^{-1}Q(t)y \cdot Q(t)y - \frac{1}{2}R(t)y \cdot y. \end{aligned}$$

Then $X_H(t, x, y) = J_0 S(t)\mathbf{u}$ with $\mathbf{u} = (x^T, y^T)^T$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (\tilde{x}^T, \tilde{y}^T)^T$ is a τ-periodic solution of (2.15).

Let

$$\begin{aligned} EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) &= \left\{ y \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, y(-t) = y(t)\, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, \\ OW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) &= \left\{ y \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, y(-t) = -y(t)\, \forall t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.4 ([LuW2, Th.3.4]) *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.2, suppose furthermore that*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} P(t + \tau) = P(t) = P(t)^T = P(-t)\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ R(t + \tau) = R(t) = R(t)^T = R(-t)\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ Q(t + \tau) = Q(t) = -Q(-t)\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \end{array} \right. \tag{2.17}$$

and thus L *in Lemma 2.2 satisfies* (L4)*. So the present* $S(t)$ *in (2.14) also satisfies the Assumption* B*. Let* $\tilde{y}$ *be a critical point of the* `restriction` f^E_τ *of the functional* f_τ *to* $EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$*. (It is also a critical point of the functional* f_τ *on* $W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ *because* f_τ *is even). As in Lemma 2.1, let* Ψ *denote the fundamental solution of (2.15). Let*

$$\begin{aligned} EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) &= EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^+ \oplus EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^0 \oplus EW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^-, \\ OW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) &= OW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^+ \oplus OW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^0 \oplus OW^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)^- \end{aligned}$$

be respectively $d^2f_\tau(\tilde{y})$-orthogonal decompositions according to $d^2f_\tau(\tilde{y})$ being positive, null, and negative definite. Then

$$\dim EW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)^- = m^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) = \mu_{1,\tau}(\Psi), \tag{2.18}$$
$$\dim EW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)^0 = m^0_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) = \nu_{1,\tau}(\Psi), \tag{2.19}$$
$$\dim OW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)^- = \mu_{2,\tau}(\Psi) - n, \tag{2.20}$$
$$\nu_\tau(\Psi) = \nu_{1,\tau}(\Psi) + \nu_{2,\tau}(\Psi). \tag{2.21}$$

For conveniences we denote by

$$m^-_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) := \dim OW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)^-, \tag{2.22}$$
$$m^0_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) := \dim OW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)^0. \tag{2.23}$$

Then under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.1(ii)(iii) and (2.21) become

$$\left|n + m^-_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) - m^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y})\right| \le n, \tag{2.24}$$
$$m^-_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) + m^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) = m^-_\tau(f_\tau,\tilde{y}), \tag{2.25}$$
$$m^0_\tau(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) = m^0_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) + m^0_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}). \tag{2.26}$$

3 Iteration inequalities of the Morse index

3.1. The case of general periodic solutions. In this subsection we always assume: M is C^3-smooth, L is C^2-smooth and satisfies (L1)-(L3). Let $\gamma \in E_\tau$ be a critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ. It is a τ-periodic map from $\mathbb{R}$ to M. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is also $k\tau$-periodic map and therefore determines an element in $E_{k\tau}$, denoted by γ^k for the sake of clearness. It is not difficult to see that γ^k is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $E_{k\tau}$. Let

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$$

denote the `Morse index` and `nullity` of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $E_{k\tau}$ respectively. Note that

$$0 \le m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le 2n \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(This can be derived from (2.16) and Lemma 3.2 below). A natural question is how to estimate $m^-(\gamma^k)$ in terms of $m^-_\tau(\gamma)$, $m^0_\tau(\gamma)$ and $m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$. The following theorem gives an answer.

Theorem 3.1 *For a critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ, assume that $\gamma^*TM \to S_\tau$ is trivial. Then the mean Morse index*

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)}{k} \tag{3.1}$$

always exists, and it holds that

$$\max\left\{0, k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) - n\right\} \le m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le k\hat{m}_\tau(\gamma) + n - m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.2}$$

Consequently, for any critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ, $\hat{m}^-_{2\tau}(\gamma^2)$ exists and

$$\max\left\{0, k\hat{m}^-_{2\tau}(\gamma^2) - n\right\} \le m^-_{2k\tau}(\gamma^{2k}) \le k\hat{m}_{2\tau}(\gamma) + n - m^0_{2k\tau}(\gamma^{2k}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \tag{3.3}$$

because $(\gamma^2)^*TM \to S_{2\tau}$ is always trivial.

Before proving this result it should be noted that the following special case is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1(i) and Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 3.2 *Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.2, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{y}$ is also a $k\tau$-periodic solution of (2.13), denoted by $\tilde{y}^k$. Then $\tilde{y}^k$ is a critical point of the functional*

$$f_{k\tau}(y) = \int_0^{k\tau} L(t, y(t), \dot{y}(t))dt$$

on $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y}) := \lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{m^-_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau}, \tilde{y}^k)}{k} = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \frac{i_{k\tau}(\Psi^k)}{k} = \hat{i}_\tau(\Psi), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{0, k\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y}) - n\} &\le m^-_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau}, \tilde{y}^k) \\ &\le k\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau, \tilde{y}) + n - m^0_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau}, \tilde{y}^k) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

with $0 \le m^0_\tau(f_{k\tau}, \tilde{y}^k) \le 2n$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

This result was actually used in [Lo2, LoLu, LuW2]. In the following we shall show that Theorem 3.1 can be reduced to the special case.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. *Step 1. Reduce to the case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$.* Let $\gamma \in E_\tau$ be a critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on E_τ with **trivial pullback** $\gamma^*TM \to S_\tau$. Take a C^2-smooth loop $\gamma_0 : S_\tau \to M$ such that $\max_t d(\gamma(t), \gamma_0(t)) < \rho$, where d and ρ are the distance and injectivity radius of M with respect to some chosen Riemannian metric on M respectively. (Actually we can choose $\gamma_0 = \gamma$ because γ_0 is C^2-smooth under the assumptions of this subsection). Clearly, γ and γ_0 are homotopic, and thus $\gamma_0^*TM \to S_\tau$ is trivial too. Since γ_0 is C^2-smooth, we can choose a C^2-smooth orthogonal trivialization

$$S_\tau \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \gamma_0^*TM,\ (t, q) \mapsto \Phi(t)q. \tag{3.6}$$

It naturally leads to a smooth orthogonal trivialization of $(\gamma_0^k)^*TM$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_{k\tau} \times \mathbb{R}^n \to (\gamma_0^k)^*TM,\ (t, q) \mapsto \Phi(t)q. \tag{3.7}$$

Let $B^n_\rho(0)$ denote an open ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ centered at 0 with radius ρ. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a coordinate chart on $E_{k\tau}$ containing γ^k,

$$\phi_{k\tau} : W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B^n_\rho(0)) \to E_{k\tau}, \quad \phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha})(t) = \exp_{\gamma_0^k(t)}(\Phi(t)\tilde{\alpha}(t)). \tag{3.8}$$

Clearly, $\phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha})$ has a period τ if and only if $\tilde{\alpha}$ is actually τ-periodic. Thus we have a unique $\tilde{\gamma}\in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, B^n_\rho(0))$ such that $\phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=\gamma^k$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Denote by the iteration maps

$$\begin{aligned}
&\psi^k: E_\tau\to E_{k\tau},\ \alpha\mapsto\alpha^k,\\
&\psi^k: T_\alpha E_\tau\to T_{\alpha^k}E_{k\tau},\ \ \xi\mapsto\xi^k,\\
&\tilde{\psi}^k: W^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)\to W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n),\ \tilde{\alpha}\mapsto\tilde{\alpha}^k.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\phi_{k\tau}\circ\tilde{\psi}^k=\psi^k\circ\phi_\tau\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.9}$$

For any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}: W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B^n_\rho(0))\to\mathbb{R},\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}=\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}\circ\phi_{k\tau}. \tag{3.10}$$

Then $\tilde{\gamma}=\phi_\tau^{-1}(\gamma)$ is a critical point of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$, and therefore $\tilde{\gamma}^k=\phi_{k\tau}^{-1}(\gamma^k)=\tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{\gamma})$ is a critical point of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Moreover, the Morse indexes and nullities of these critical points satisfy the relations:

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)\quad\text{and}\quad m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k),\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.11}$$

Viewing γ_0 a τ-periodic map from $\mathbb{R}\to M$, consider the C^2-smooth map

$$\Xi:\mathbb{R}\times B^n_\rho(0)\to M,\quad (t,\tilde{q})\mapsto\exp_{\gamma_0(t)}\big(\Phi(t)\tilde{q}\big). \tag{3.12}$$

Then $\Xi(t+\tau,\tilde{q})=\Xi(t,\tilde{q})$ for any $(t,\tilde{q})\in\mathbb{R}\times M$. Clearly,

$$\phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha})(t)=\Xi(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t))\quad\text{and} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha}))(t)=\frac{d}{dt}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})|_{\tilde{q}=\tilde{\alpha}(t)}+d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t))(\dot{\tilde{\alpha}}(t)) \tag{3.14}$$

for any $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}\in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B^n_\rho(0))$. Define $\tilde{L}:\mathbb{R}\times B^n_\rho(0)\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$\tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})=L\left(t,\Xi(t,\tilde{q}),\frac{d}{dt}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})+d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})(\tilde{v})\right). \tag{3.15}$$

Then $\tilde{L}(t+\tau,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})=\tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})$ $\forall(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})\in\mathbb{R}\times B^n_\rho(0)\times\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\tilde{L}$ also satisfies the conditions (L2')-(L3') (up to changing the constants). For $\tilde{\alpha}\in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, B^n_\rho(0))$, by (3.10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\alpha}) &= \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}((\phi^k(\tilde{\alpha}))\\
&= \int_0^{k\tau}L\left(t,\phi^k(\tilde{\alpha})(t),\frac{d}{dt}(\phi^k(\tilde{\alpha}))(t)\right)dt\\
&= \int_0^{k\tau}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\alpha}(t),\dot{\tilde{\alpha}}(t)\right)dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore we may assume $M=\mathbb{R}^n$. That is, by (3.11) we only need to prove

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma}):=\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)}{k}\qquad\text{exists,} \tag{3.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\max\big\{0,k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})-n\big\}&\le m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\\
&\le k\hat{m}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})+n-m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

Step 2. Reduce to the case of Lemma 3.2. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{L}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi}) &= \int_0^\tau \Big(D_{\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)(\tilde{\xi}(t)) + D_{\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)(\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t))\Big)\, dt \\ &= \int_0^\tau \Big(D_{\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right) - \frac{d}{dt} D_{\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)\Big)\cdot \tilde{\xi}(t)\, dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $\tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Since $d\tilde{L}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma}) = 0$, we have also

$$\begin{aligned} d^2\tilde{L}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi},\tilde{\eta}) = \int_0^\tau \Big(& D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)\left(\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t),\dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)\right) \\ & + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)\left(\tilde{\xi}(t),\dot{\tilde{\eta}}(t)\right) \\ & + D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)\left(\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t),\tilde{\eta}(t)\right) \\ & + D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right)\left(\tilde{\xi}(t),\tilde{\eta}(t)\right)\Big)\, dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Set

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(t) &= D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right), \\ \hat{Q}(t) &= D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right), \\ \hat{R}(t) &= D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}\left(t,\tilde{\gamma}(t),\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)\right) \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{3.19}$$

and

$$\hat{L}(t,\tilde{y},\tilde{v}) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{P}(t)\tilde{v}\cdot\tilde{v} + \hat{Q}(t)\tilde{y}\cdot\tilde{v} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{R}(t)\tilde{y}\cdot\tilde{y}. \tag{3.20}$$

Clearly, they satisfy the conditions of Lemma 2.2, and $\tilde{y} = 0 \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is a critical point of the functional

$$\hat{f}_\tau(\tilde{y}) = \int_0^\tau \hat{L}\left(t,\tilde{y}(t),\dot{\tilde{y}}(t)\right) dt$$

on $W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$. It is also easily checked that

$$d^2\hat{f}_\tau(0)(\tilde{\xi},\tilde{\eta}) = d^2\tilde{L}_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})(\tilde{\xi},\tilde{\eta}) \quad \forall \tilde{\xi},\tilde{\eta} \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n).$$

It follows that

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) = m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_{k\tau}(\hat{f}_{k\tau}, 0) = m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

These and Lemma 3.2 together give the desired (3.17) and (3.18). □

3.2. The case of even periodic solutions. Let M and L be as in §3.1. But we also assume that L satisfies (L4). Note that the even periodic solutions are always contractible. Let $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ denote the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $EH_{k\tau}$. As noted in the introduction, if $\gamma \in EH_\tau$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ on EH_τ then γ^k is a critical point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k)$$

denote the `Morse index` and `nullity` of $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ on $EH_{k\tau}$ respectively. Then $0 \le m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le 2n$ for any k. We shall prove

Theorem 3.3 *Let L satisfy the conditions (L1)-(L4). Then for any critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ on EH_τ, the mean Morse index*

$$\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma) := \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k)}{k} \tag{3.21}$$

exists, and it holds that

$$m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) + m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le n \quad \forall k\in\mathbb{N} \quad \text{if} \quad \hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma) = 0. \tag{3.22}$$

Firstly, by (2.10) and (2.16) the mean Morse index

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) := \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{m^-_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k)}{k} \tag{3.23}$$

exists and equals to $\hat{i}_\tau(\Psi)$. Under the assumptions of Lemma 2.4, for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{y}^k$ is a critical point of the restriction $f^E_{k\tau}$ of the functional $f_{k\tau}$ to $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$, and it follows from (2.12), (2.18), (2.20) and (2.22) that

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) := \lim_{k\to+\infty}\frac{m^-_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k)}{k} = \hat{\mu}_{1,\tau}(\Psi) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau,\tilde{y}), \tag{3.24}$$

$$\hat{m}^-_{2,\tau}(f_\tau,\tilde{y}) := \lim_{k\to+\infty}\frac{m^-_{2,k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k)}{k} = \hat{\mu}_{2,\tau}(\Psi) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{m}^-_\tau(f_\tau,\tilde{y}). \tag{3.25}$$

Moreover, by (2.25) and (2.26), for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &m^-_{2,k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) + m^-_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) = m^-_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k),\\ &m^0_{k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) = m^0_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) + m^0_{2,k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k). \end{aligned}$$

From these we derive that (3.5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{0, 2k\hat{m}^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) - n\} &\le m^-_{2,k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) + m^-_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k)\\ &\le 2k\hat{m}^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) + n - m^0_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) - m^0_{2,k\tau}(f_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. In particular, if $\hat{m}^-_\tau(f^E_\tau,\tilde{y}) = 0$, then

$$m^-_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) + m^0_{k\tau}(f^E_{k\tau},\tilde{y}^k) \le n \quad \forall k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{3.27}$$

([LuW2, Th.3.7]).

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Since γ is even we can still choose γ_0 and Φ in (3.6) to be even, i.e. $\gamma_0(-t) = \gamma_0(t)$ and $\Phi(-t) = \Phi(t)$ for any $t\in\mathbb{R}$. These imply

$$\Xi(-t,\tilde{q}) = \Xi(t,\tilde{q}), \quad \frac{d}{dt}\Xi(-t,\tilde{q}) = -\frac{d}{ds}\Xi(s,\tilde{q})|_{s=-t} = \frac{d}{dt}\Xi(t,\tilde{q}). \tag{3.28}$$

It follows that the coordinate chart $\phi_{k\tau}$ in (3.8) naturally restricts to a coordinate chart on $EH_{k\tau}$,

$$\phi^E_{k\tau} : EW^{1,2}\big(S_{k\tau}, B^n_\rho(0)\big) \to EH_{k\tau} \tag{3.29}$$

which also satisfies

$$\phi^E_{k\tau}\circ\tilde{\psi}^k=\psi^k\circ\phi^E_\tau\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}.\tag{3.30}$$

By (L4), (3.15) and (3.28) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{L}(-t,\tilde{q},-\tilde{v}) &= L\left(-t,\Xi(-t,\tilde{q}),\frac{d}{d(-t)}\Xi(-t,\tilde{q})+d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(-t,\tilde{q})(-\tilde{v})\right)\\ &= L\left(-t,\Xi(t,\tilde{q}),-\frac{d}{dt}\Xi(-t,\tilde{q})-d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})(\tilde{v})\right)\\ &= L\left(t,\Xi(t,\tilde{q}),\frac{d}{dt}\Xi(-t,\tilde{q})+d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})(\tilde{v})\right)\\ &= L\left(t,\Xi(t,\tilde{q}),\frac{d}{dt}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})+d_{\tilde{q}}\Xi(t,\tilde{q})(\tilde{v})\right)\\ &= \tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v}).\end{aligned}\tag{3.31}$$

That is, $\tilde{L}$ also satisfies (L4). It follows that for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, the functional

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}:EW^{1,2}\big(S_{k\tau},B^n_\rho(0)\big)\to\mathbb{R},\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}=\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}\circ\phi^E_{k\tau}\tag{3.32}$$

is exactly the restriction of the functional $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ in (3.10) to $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},B^n_\rho(0))$. Hence the question is reduced to the case $M=\mathbb{R}^n$ again. That is, we only need to prove

$$\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}):=\lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)}{k}\quad\text{exists},\tag{3.33}$$

$$m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)+m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\le n\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}\quad\text{if}\quad\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\tilde{\gamma})=0.\tag{3.34}$$

By (3.31) we have

$$\begin{aligned}D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(-t,\tilde{q},-\tilde{v})&=D_{\tilde{v}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v}),\\ D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(-t,\tilde{q},-\tilde{v})&=-D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{v}}\tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v}),\\ D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(-t,\tilde{q},-\tilde{v})&=D_{\tilde{q}\tilde{q}}\tilde{L}(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})\end{aligned}$$

for any $(t,\tilde{q},\tilde{v})\in\mathbb{R}\times B^n_\rho(0)\times\mathbb{R}^n$. Since $\tilde{\gamma}(-t)=\tilde{\gamma}(t)$ and $\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(-t)=-\dot{\tilde{\gamma}}(t)$, it follows from this that $\hat{P}$, $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{R}$ in (3.19) satisfy (2.17). For $\hat{L}$ in (3.20) and the functionals

$$\hat{f}^E_{k\tau}(\tilde{y}):=\int_0^{k\tau}\hat{L}\left(t,\tilde{y}(t),\dot{\tilde{y}}(t)\right)dt$$

on $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$, $k=1,2,\cdots$, we have

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\hat{f}^E_{k\tau},0)=m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\quad\text{and}\quad m^0_{k\tau}(\hat{f}^E_{k\tau},0)=m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}.\tag{3.35}$$

By (3.24) and (3.27) we get

$$\hat{m}^-_\tau(\hat{f}^E_\tau,0):=\lim_{k\to+\infty}\frac{m^-_{k\tau}(\hat{f}^E_{k\tau},0)}{k}\tag{3.36}$$

exists, and if $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\hat{f}^E_\tau,0)=0$,

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\hat{f}^E_{k\tau},0)+m^0_{k\tau}(\hat{f}^E_{k\tau},0)\le n\quad\forall k\in\mathbb{N}.\tag{3.37}$$

Now (3.35)-(3.37) give (3.33) and (3.34), and therefore the desired (3.21) and (3.22). $\Box$

4 Critical modules under iteration maps

In this section we shall study relations of critical modules under iteration maps in three different cases. We first recall a few of notions. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a C^2 Hilbert-Riemannian manifold and $f \in C^1(\mathcal{M}, \mathbb{R})$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition. Denote by $\mathcal{K}(f)$ the set of critical points of f. Recall that a connected submanifold N of $\mathcal{M}$ is a *critical submanifold* of f if it is closed, consists entirely of critical points of f and $f|_N = \text{constant}$. Let $N \subset \mathcal{M}$ be an isolated critical submanifold of f with $f|_N = c$, and U be a neighborhood of N such that $U \cap \mathcal{K}(f) = N$. For $q \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, recall that the q^{th} critical group with coefficient group $\mathbb{K}$ of f at N is defined by

$$C_q(f, N; \mathbb{K}) := H_q\big(\{f \le c\} \cap U, (\{f \le c\} \setminus N) \cap U; \mathbb{K}\big). \tag{4.1}$$

Hereafter $H_*(X, Y; \mathbb{K})$ stands for the relative singular homology with the abelian coefficient group $\mathbb{K}$ without special statements. The group $C_q(f, N; \mathbb{K})$ does not depend on a special choice of such neighborhoods U up to isomorphisms. There also exists another equivalent definition of critical groups, which is convenient in many situations.

Let $V : (\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{K}(f)) \to T\mathcal{M}$ be a pseudo-gradient vector field for f on $\mathcal{M}$. According to [Ch, pp.48, 74] and [Wa, Def.2.3] or [GM1], a pair of topological subspaces (W, W^-) of $\mathcal{M}$ is called a **Gromoll-Meyer pair** with respect to V for N, if
(1) W is a closed neighborhood of N possessing the `mean value property`, i.e., $\forall t_1 < t_2$, $\eta(t_i) \in W$, $i = 1, 2$, implies $\eta(t) \in W$ for all $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, where $\eta(t)$ is the decreasing flow with respect to V. And there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $W \cap f_{c-\epsilon} = f^{-1}[c-\epsilon, c) \cap \mathcal{K}(f) = \emptyset$, $W \cap \mathcal{K}(f) = N$;
(2) the set $W^- = \{p \in W \,|\, \eta(t, p) \notin W, \forall t > 0\}$;
(3) W^- is a piecewise submanifold, and the flow η is transversal to W^-.

By [Ch, pp.74] or [Wa, §2], there exists an (arbitrarily small) Gromoll-Meyer pair for N, (W, W^-), and for such a pair it holds that

$$H_*(W, W^-; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_*(f, N; \mathbb{K}). \tag{4.2}$$

Hence $H_*(W, W^-; \mathbb{K})$ may be used to give an equivalent definition of $C_*(f, N; \mathbb{K})$. We need the following fact which seems to be obvious, but is often neglected.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be C^2 Hilbert-Riemannian manifolds, and $\Theta : \mathcal{M}_1 \to \mathcal{M}_2$ be a homeomorphism. Suppose that $f_i \in C^1(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, 2$, satisfy the Palais-Smale condition and $f_2 = f_1 \circ \Theta$. Let $N_1 \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ and $N_2 = \Theta(N_1) \subset \mathcal{M}_2$ be isolated critical submanifolds of f_1 and f_2 respectively. Assume that (W_1, W_1^-) is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of N_1 of f_1. Then*

$$C_*(f_2, N_2; \mathbb{K}) \cong H_*(\Theta(W_1), \Theta(W_1^-); \mathbb{K})$$

though $(\Theta(W_1), \Theta(W_1^-))$ is not necessarily a Gromoll-Meyer pair of N_2 of f_2 (because Θ is only a homeomorphism). Moreover, for $c = f_1|_{N_1}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ it is clear that

$$(W_1, W_1^-) \subset \big(f_1^{-1}[c-\epsilon, c+\epsilon], f_1^{-1}(c-\epsilon)\big)$$

implies $\big(\Theta(W_1),\Theta(W_1^-)\big)\subset\big(f_2^{-1}[c-\epsilon,c+\epsilon],f_2^{-1}(c-\epsilon)\big)$.

Proof. Take a small open neighborhood U of N_1 so that $U\subset W_1$. Since $\Theta\big(\{f_1\le c\}\cap U\big)=\{f_2\le c\}\cap U$ and $\Theta\big((\{f_1\le c\}\setminus N_1)\cap U\big)=(\{f_2\le c\}\setminus N_2)\cap\Theta(U)$, we have isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}&\Theta_*: H_*(W_1,W_1^-;\mathbb{K})\to H_*(\Theta(W_1),\Theta(W_1^-);\mathbb{K}),\\ &\Theta_*: H_*\big(\{f_1\le c\}\cap U,(\{f_1\le c\}\setminus N_1)\cap U;\mathbb{K}\big)\to\\ &\qquad\qquad H_*\big(\{f_2\le c\}\cap\Theta(U),(\{f_2\le c\}\setminus N_2)\cap\Theta(U);\mathbb{K}\big)\\ &\qquad\qquad = C_*(f_2,N_2;\mathbb{K}).\end{aligned}$$

By (4.1) and (4.2), $H_*(W_1,W_1^-;\mathbb{K})\cong H_*\big(\{f_1\le c\}\cap U,(\{f_1\le c\}\setminus N_1)\cap U;\mathbb{K}\big)$. The desired conclusion is obtained. $\Box$.

It is this result that we may often treat $(\Theta(W_1),\Theta(W_1^-))$ as a Gromoll-Meyer pair without special statements. For conveniences we call it a **topological Gromoll-Meyer** of f_2 at N_2. The usual Gromoll-Meyer pair can be viewed the special case of it. Moreover, if $\Gamma:\mathcal{M}_2\to\mathcal{M}_3$ is a C^1-diffeomorphism onto another C^2 Hilbert-Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M}_3$, then $(\Gamma\circ\Theta(W_1),\Gamma\circ\Theta(W_1^-))$ is also a topological Gromoll-Meyer pair of $f_3=f_2\circ\Gamma^{-1}$ at $N_3=\Gamma(N_2)$. (4.2) and Lemma 4.1 show that the topological Gromoll-Meyer may be used to give an equivalent definition of the critical group.

To understand the Note at the end of proof of Theorem 5.1 of [Ch, pp. 44] we add a lemma, which is need in this paper.

Lemma 4.2 *Let H_i be Hilbert spaces with origins θ_i, , $i=1,2,3$. For $\varepsilon>0$ let $f\in C^2(B_\varepsilon(\theta_1)\times B_\varepsilon(\theta_2)\times B_\varepsilon(\theta_3),\mathbb{R})$. Assume that $d_3f(x_1,\theta_2,\theta_3)=0$ for $x_1\in B_\varepsilon(\theta_1)$ and that $d_3^2f(\theta_1,\theta_2,\theta_3):H_3\to H_3$ is a Banach space isomorphism. Then there exist a small $0<\delta\ll\varepsilon$ and C^1-map $h:B_\delta(\theta_1)\times B_\delta(\theta_2)\to H_3$ such that*
(i) $d_3f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))=\theta_3$ for all $(x_1,x_2)\in B_\delta(\theta_1)\times B_\delta(\theta_2)$,
(ii) $g:B_\delta(\theta_1)\times B_\delta(\theta_2)\to\mathbb{R}$, $(x_1,x_2)\mapsto g(x_1,x_2)=f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))$ is C^2.

Proof. Applying the implicit function theorem to the map

$$d_3f: B_\varepsilon(\theta_1)\times B_\varepsilon(\theta_2)\times B_\varepsilon(\theta_3)\to H_3$$

we get a $0<\delta\ll\varepsilon$ and a C^1-map $h:B_\delta(\theta_1)\times B_\delta(\theta_2)\to H_3$ such that $h(\theta_1,\theta_2)=\theta_3$ and

$$d_3f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))=0\ \forall(x_1,x_2)\in B_\delta(\theta_1)\times B_\delta(\theta_2).$$

Set $g(x_1,x_2)=f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}dg(x_1,x_2)&=d_{(1,2)}f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))+d_3f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))\circ d_{(x_1,x_2)}h(x_1,x_2)\\&=d_{(1,2)}f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))\end{aligned}$$

because $d_3f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))=0$, where $d_{(1,2)}$ denotes the differential for the first two variables of f. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}d^2g(x_1,x_2)&=d^2_{(1,2)}f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))\\&+\ d_3d_{(1,2)}f(x_1,x_2,h(x_1,x_2))\circ d_{(x_1,x_2)}h(x_1,x_2).\end{aligned}$$

The desired claims are proved. □

4.1. The arguments in this section are following Section 3 in [Lo2]. However, since our arguments are on a Hilbert manifold, rather than Hilbert space, some new techniques are needed. The precise proofs are also given for reader's convenience. In this subsection we always assume: M is C^3-smooth, L is C^2-smooth and satisfies (L1)-(L3).

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\gamma \in H_\tau(\alpha)$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha)$ such that γ^k is an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $\gamma^* T^* M \to S_\tau$ is trivial. Then there exist Gromoll-Meyer pairs $\big(W(\gamma), W(\gamma)^-\big)$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at γ and $\big(W(\gamma^k), W(\gamma^k)^-\big)$ of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at γ^k such that*

$$\big(\psi^k(W(\gamma)), \psi^k(W(\gamma)^-)\big) \subset \big(W(\gamma^k), W(\gamma^k)^-\big). \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\phi_{j\tau} : W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, B^n_\rho(0)) \to H_{j\tau}(\alpha^j) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} = \mathcal{L}_{j\tau} \circ \phi_{j\tau} \tag{4.4}$$

as in (3.8) and (3.10). They satisfy (3.9), i.e. $\phi_{j\tau} \circ \tilde{\psi}^j = \psi^j \circ \phi_\tau \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\psi^j : H_\tau(\alpha) \to H_{j\tau}(\alpha^j)$ and $\tilde{\psi}^j : W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) \to W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ are the iteration maps. Let $\tilde{\gamma} = (\phi_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma)$. Then $\phi_{j\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^j) = \gamma^j$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\|\cdot\|_\tau$ and $\|\cdot\|_{k\tau}$ denote the norms in $W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ respectively. By the construction on page 49 of [Ch], we set

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}) &:= \mathcal{L}_\tau^{-1}[c-\varepsilon, c+\varepsilon] \cap \big\{x \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, \lambda \mathcal{L}_\tau(x) + \|x\|_\tau^2 \le \mu\big\},\\
\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})^- &:= \mathcal{L}_\tau^{-1}(c-\varepsilon) \cap \big\{x \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, \lambda \mathcal{L}_\tau(x) + \|x\|_\tau^2 \le \mu\big\},\\
\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) &:= \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^{-1}[kc-k\varepsilon, kc+k\varepsilon] \cap \big\{y \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, \lambda \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(y) + \|y\|_{k\tau}^2 \le k\mu\big\},\\
\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^- &:= \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}^{-1}(kc-k\varepsilon) \cap \big\{y \in W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) \,|\, \lambda \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(y) + \|y\|_{k\tau}^2 \le k\mu\big\},
\end{aligned}$$

where positive numbers $\lambda, \mu, \varepsilon$ and $k\lambda, k\mu, k\varepsilon$ are such that the conditions as in (5.13)-(5.15) on page 49 of [Ch] hold. Then $\big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})^-\big)$ and $\big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^-\big)$ are Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$ at $\tilde{\gamma}$ and of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $\tilde{\gamma}^k$, and

$$\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})), \tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})^-)\big) \subset \big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k), \tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^-\big). \tag{4.5}$$

Define

$$\left.\begin{aligned}
\big(W(\gamma), W(\gamma)^-\big) &:= \big(\phi_\tau(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})), \phi_\tau(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma})^-)\big),\\
\big(W(\gamma^k), W(\gamma^k)^-\big) &:= \big(\phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)), \phi_{k\tau}(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^-)\big).
\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\phi_{k\tau} \circ \tilde{\psi}^k = \psi^k \circ \phi_\tau$, (4.3) follows from (4.5). □

When γ and γ^k are isolated, according to the definition of critical groups in (4.1) it is easy to see that the iteration map $\psi^k : H_\tau(\alpha) \to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ induces homomorphisms

$$(\psi^k)_* : C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}).$$

Lemma 4.3 shows that the homomorphisms are still well-defined when the critical groups $C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K})$ and $C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K})$ are defined by (4.2). Later similar cases are always understand in this way. Our purpose is to prove:

Theorem 4.4 *Let $\gamma \in H_\tau(\alpha)$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha)$ such that $\gamma^*TM \to S_\tau$ is trivial. Suppose that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the iteration γ^k is also an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, and*

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^-_\tau(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^0_\tau(\gamma). \tag{4.7}$$

Then for $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\gamma \in H_\tau(\alpha)$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\gamma^k \in H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$,

$$\begin{aligned}&(W_\tau, W_\tau^-) \subset \big((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}[c-\epsilon, c+\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-\epsilon)\big) \quad \textit{and}\\ &(W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) \subset \big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}[kc-k\epsilon, kc+k\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-k\epsilon)\big),\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(\psi^k(W_\tau), \psi^k(W_\tau^-)) \subset (W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-) \tag{4.8}$$

and that the homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi^k)_* : C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) &:= H_*(W_\tau, W_\tau^-; \mathbb{K})\\ &\to C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) := H_*(W_{k\tau}, W_{k\tau}^-; \mathbb{K})\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

is an isomorphism. Specially, $(\psi^1)_* = id$, and $(\psi^k)_* \circ (\psi^l)_* = (\psi^{kl})_*$ if the iterations γ^l and γ^{kl} are also isolated, and

$$\left.\begin{aligned} m^-_{kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl}) = m^-_{l\tau}(\gamma^l) = m^-_\tau(\gamma),\\ m^0_{kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl}) = m^0_{l\tau}(\gamma^l) = m^0_\tau(\gamma)\end{aligned}\right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

When $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, this theorem was proved by [Lo2, Th.3.7]. We shall reduce the proof of Theorem 4.4 to that case.

Using the chart in (4.4) let $\tilde\gamma = (\phi_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma)$. Then $\tilde\gamma^j = (\phi_{j\tau})^{-1}(\gamma^j)$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\tilde\gamma^j$ are isolated critical points of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{j\tau} = \mathcal{L}_{j\tau} \circ \phi_{j\tau}$ in $W^{1,2}(S_{j\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $j = 1, k, l, kl$. Moreover, $m^-_{j\tau}(\tilde\gamma^j) = m^-_\tau(\tilde\gamma)$ and $m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde\gamma^j) = m^0_\tau(\tilde\gamma)$ for $j = k, l, kl$. Let $\big(\tilde W(\tilde\gamma), \tilde W(\tilde\gamma)^-\big)$ and $\big(\tilde W(\tilde\gamma^k), \tilde W(\tilde\gamma^k)^-\big)$ be Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$ at $\tilde\gamma$ and of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $\tilde\gamma^k$, satisfying (4.5). Define

$$\begin{aligned}C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, \tilde\gamma; \mathbb{K}) &= H_*\big(\tilde W(\tilde\gamma), \tilde W(\tilde\gamma)^-; \mathbb{K}\big),\\ C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) &= H_*\big(W(\gamma), W(\gamma)^-; \mathbb{K}\big),\\ C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde\gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) &= H_*\big(\tilde W(\tilde\gamma^k), \tilde W(\tilde\gamma^k)^-; \mathbb{K}\big),\\ C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) &= H_*\big(W(\gamma^k), \tilde W(\gamma^k)^-; \mathbb{K}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi_{k\tau} \circ \tilde\psi^k = \psi^k \circ \phi_\tau$, we have $(\phi_{k\tau})_* \circ (\tilde\psi^k)_* = (\psi^k)_* \circ (\phi_\tau)_*$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}&(\phi_\tau)_* : C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, \tilde\gamma; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) \qquad \text{and}\\ &(\phi_{k\tau})_* : C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde\gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K})\end{aligned}$$

are isomorphisms. Hence we only need to prove that

$$(\tilde\psi^k)_* : C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, \tilde\gamma; \mathbb{K}) \longrightarrow C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde\gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) \tag{4.11}$$

is an isomorphism which maps generators to the generators. This is exactly one proved by [Lo2, Th.3.7]. Theorem 3.7 in [Lo2] also gives that $(\tilde{\psi}^1)_* = id$ and $(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \circ (\tilde{\psi}^l)_* = (\tilde{\psi}^{kl})_*$. So other conclusions follow immediately.

For later conveniences we outline the arguments therein. Let

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n) &= M^0(\tilde{\gamma}_k) \oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)^- \oplus M(\tilde{\gamma})^+ \\ &= M^0(\tilde{\gamma}_k) \oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)^\perp \end{aligned}$$

be the orthogonal decomposition of the space $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ according to the null, negative, and positive definiteness of the quadratic form $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}''_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$. The generalized Morse lemma ([Ch, Th.5.1, pp. 44] yields a homeomorphism $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}$ from some open neighborhood $\tilde{U}_{k\tau}$ of 0 in $W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\tilde{U}_{k\tau}) \subset W^{1,2}(S_{k\tau}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}(0) = \tilde{\gamma}^k$, and a map $\tilde{h}_{k\tau} \in C^1\left(\tilde{U}_{k\tau} \cap M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^0, M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^\perp\right)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}(\eta + \xi)) &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}\big(\tilde{\gamma}^k + \eta + \tilde{h}_{k\tau}(\eta)\big) + \frac{1}{2}\big(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}''_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\xi, \xi\big) \\ &\equiv \tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}(\eta) + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}(\xi) \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

for any $\eta + \xi \in \tilde{U}_{k\tau} \cap \big(M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^0 \oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)^\perp\big)$. (**Note**: $\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}$ is C^∞, $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ is C^2 as noted at the end of proof of Theorem 5.1 on the page 44 of [Ch]. Carefully checking the beginning proof therein one can easily derive this from Lemma 4.2). It is easy to prove that

$$\tilde{\psi}^k\big(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_\tau(x)\big) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{k\tau}\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(x)\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\psi}^k\big(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}''_\tau(x)\xi\big) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}''_{k\tau}\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(x)\big)\tilde{\psi}^k(\xi) \tag{4.13}$$

for any $\tau, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \in W^{1,2}\big(S_\tau, B^n_\rho(0)\big)$ and $\xi \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\eta)) = k\tilde{\alpha}(\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\xi)) = k\tilde{\beta}_\tau(\xi) \tag{4.14}$$

for any $\eta \in \tilde{U}_\tau \cap M^0(\tilde{\gamma})$ and $\xi \in \tilde{U}_\tau \cap M^\perp(\tilde{\gamma})$.

Lemma 4.5 ([Lo2, Lem. 3.2, 3.3]) *The iteration map $\tilde{\psi}^k : M^*(\tilde{\gamma}) \to M^*(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$ for $* = 0, -, +$ is linear, continuous and injective. If $m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) = m^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})$, the map $\tilde{\psi}^k : M^-(\tilde{\gamma}) \to M^-(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$ is a linear diffeomorphism. If $m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) = m^0_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})$, then the map $\tilde{\psi}^k : M^0(\tilde{\gamma}) \to M^0(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$ is a linear diffeomorphism, and $\tilde{U}_{k\tau}$, the homeomorphism $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}$ and map $\tilde{h}_{k\tau} \in C^1\left(\tilde{U}_{k\tau} \cap M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^0, M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^\perp\right)$ are chosen to satisfy:*

$$\tilde{U}_{k\tau} \cap \tilde{\psi}^k(W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{U}_\tau), \tag{4.15}$$

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau} \circ \tilde{\psi}^k = \tilde{\psi}^k \circ \tilde{\Theta}_\tau : \tilde{U}_\tau \to \tilde{\Theta}_\tau(\tilde{U}_\tau \cap M^0(\tilde{\gamma}^k)), \tag{4.16}$$

$$\tilde{h}_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\eta)) = \tilde{\psi}^k(\tilde{h}_\tau(\eta)) \quad \forall \eta \in \tilde{U}_\tau \cap M(\tilde{\gamma}). \tag{4.17}$$

Let (W_0, W_0^-) and (W_1, W_1^-) be Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\alpha}_\tau$ and $\tilde{\beta}_\tau$ at their origins respectively. By [Lo2, Prop.3.5. 2°], $(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0), \tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-))$ is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ at the origin. The Gromoll-Meyer pair (W_1, W_1^-) can also be chosen to satisfy

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_1), \tilde{\psi}^k(W_1^-)) \subset (V, V^-) \tag{4.18}$$

for some Gromoll-Meyer pair (V, V^-) of $\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}$ at the origin. By [Ch, Lem.5.1. pp.51]

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(W_0 \times W_1, (W_0 \times W_1^-) \cup (W_0^- \times W_1)\right), && (4.19)\\ &\left(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-) \times V)\right) && (4.20)\end{aligned}$$

are Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}$ at their origins respectively, and also satisfy

$$\left.\begin{aligned} &\left(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0 \times W_1), \tilde{\psi}^k((W_0 \times W_1^-) \cup (W_0^- \times W_1))\right) \subset \\ &\left(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-) \times V)\right). \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.21}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{W}_\tau, \widehat{W}_\tau^-) &:= \tilde{\Theta}_\tau\left(W_0 \times W_1, (W_0 \times W_1^-) \cup (W_0^- \times W_1)\right), && (4.22)\\ (\widehat{W}_{k\tau}, \widehat{W}_{k\tau}^-) &:= \tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}\left(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-) \times V)\right) && (4.23)\end{aligned}$$

are topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau$ at $\tilde{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}$ at $\tilde{\gamma}^k$ respectively. Let

$$\begin{aligned} &C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) := H_*(W_0 \times W_1, (W_0 \times W_1^-) \cup (W_0^- \times W_1); \mathbb{K}),\\ &C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) := H_*(\widehat{W}_\tau, \widehat{W}_\tau^-; \mathbb{K}),\\ &C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) := H_*\left(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-) \times V); \mathbb{K}\right),\\ &C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) := H_*(\widehat{W}_{k\tau}, \widehat{W}_{k\tau}^-; \mathbb{K}).\end{aligned}$$

We have the isomorphisms on critical modules,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\tilde{\Theta}_\tau)_* : C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, \tilde{\gamma}; \mathbb{K}),\\ &(\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau})_* : C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k; \mathbb{K}).\end{aligned}$$

By (4.21) we have a homomorphism

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}). \tag{4.24}$$

Moreover, (4.16) and (4.21) show that

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k(\widehat{W}_\tau), \tilde{\psi}^k(\widehat{W}_\tau^-)) \subset (\widehat{W}_{k\tau}, \widehat{W}_{k\tau}^-) \tag{4.25}$$

and therefore the homomorphism

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K})$$

satisfy

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* \circ (\tilde{\Theta}_\tau)_* = (\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau})_* \circ (\tilde{\psi}^k)_*. \tag{4.26}$$

Hence the problem is reduced to prove:

Lemma 4.6 *The Gromoll-Meyer pairs* (W_1, W_1^-) *and* (V, V^-) *in (4.18) can be chosen such that*

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_* : C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \tag{4.27}$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. For $j = 1, k$, decompose $\xi \in M(\tilde{\gamma}_j)^\perp = M(\tilde{\gamma}_j)^- \oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_j)^+$ into $\xi = \xi^- + \xi^+$ and write

$$\tilde{\beta}_{j\tau}(\xi) = \tilde{\beta}_{j\tau}(\xi^-) + \tilde{\beta}_{j\tau}(\xi^+) = \tilde{\beta}^-_{j\tau}(\xi^-) + \tilde{\beta}^+_{j\tau}(\xi^+).$$

Then $\tilde{\beta}^-_{j\tau}$ and $\tilde{\beta}^+_{j\tau}$ are negative and positive definite quadratic forms on $M(\tilde{\gamma}_j)^-$ and $M(\tilde{\gamma}_j)^+$ with Morse indexes $m^-(\tilde{\gamma}^j)$ and 0 respectively, $j = 1, k$. The (4.12)-(4.14) imply

$$\tilde{\beta}^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\xi^-)) = k\tilde{\beta}^-_\tau(\xi^-) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\psi}^k(\xi^+)) = k\tilde{\beta}^-_\tau(\xi^+)$$

for any $\xi^- \in M^-(\tilde{\gamma})$ and $\xi^+ \in M^+(\tilde{\gamma})$. Since $m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) = m^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})$, by Lemma 4.5 the map $\tilde{\psi}^k : M^-(\tilde{\gamma}) \to M^-(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$ is a linear diffeomorphism. Let (W_{11}, W_{11}^-) be a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\tilde{\beta}^-_\tau$ at the origin. Then

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}), \tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-)) \tag{4.28}$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\tilde{\beta}^-_{k\tau}$ at the origin. For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, set

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{12} &:= \{\xi^+ \in M(\tilde{\gamma})^+ \,|\, \|\xi^+\|_\tau \le \delta\,\}, \\
W_{12}^- &:= \{\xi^+ \in M(\tilde{\gamma})^+ \,|\, \|\xi^+\|_\tau = \delta\,\}, \\
V_{12} &:= \{\xi^+ \in M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^+ \,|\, \|\xi^+\|_{k\tau} \le \sqrt{k}\delta\,\}, \\
V_{12}^- &:= \{\xi^+ \in M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)^+ \,|\, \|\xi^+\|_{k\tau} = \sqrt{k}\delta\,\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easily checked that (W_{12}, W_{12}^-) and (V_{12}, V_{12}^-) are Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\tilde{\beta}^+_\tau$ and $\tilde{\beta}^+_{k\tau}$ at their origins respectively, and that

$$\Big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}), \tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}^-)\Big) \subset (V_{12}, V_{12}^-). \tag{4.29}$$

By [Ch, Lem.5.1. pp.51], we may take

$$(W_1, W_1^-) := \big(W_{11} \times W_{12}, (W_{11} \times W_{12}^-) \cup (W_{11}^- \times W_{12})\big), \tag{4.30}$$

$$(V, V^-) := \Big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}) \times V_{12}, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}) \times V_{12}^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-) \times V_{12})\Big). \tag{4.31}$$

Then $(W_0 \times W_1, (W_0 \times W_1^-) \cup (W_0^- \times W_1))$ becomes (W, W^-), and

$$C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) = H_*(W, W^-; \mathbb{K}), \tag{4.32}$$

where $W := W_0 \times W_{11} \times W_{12}$ and

$$W^- := \big(W_0 \times (W_{11} \times W_{12}^-) \cup (W_{11}^- \times W_{12})\big) \cup (W_0^- \times W_{11} \times W_{12}). \tag{4.33}$$

Moreover, $\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V, (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0) \times V^-) \cup (\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-) \times V)\big)$ becomes (U, U^-), and

$$C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) = H_*(U, U^-; \mathbb{K}), \tag{4.34}$$

where $U=\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0)\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times V_{12}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}U^- = \big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0)\times(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times V_{12}^-)\cup(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-)\times V_{12})\big)&\\ \cup\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-)\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times V_{12}\big).&\qquad(4.35)\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\tilde{\psi}^k(W)=\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0)\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\psi}^k(W^-) = \big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0)\times(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}^-))\cup(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-)\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}))\big)&\\ \cup\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-)\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11})\times\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12})\big).&\qquad(4.36)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\psi}^k: M^+(\tilde{\gamma})\to M^+(\tilde{\gamma}^k)$ is a linear, continuous and injection, by (4.29) and the constructions of (V_{12},V_{12}^-) and (W_{12},W_{12}^-) it is readily checked that $\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}^-)\big)$ is a deformation retract of (V_{12},V_{12}^-). It follows that

$$\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W),\tilde{\psi}^k(W^-)\big)\subset(U,U^-)$$

is a deformation retract of (U,U^-). Hence

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*: H_*(W,W^-;\mathbb{K})\to H_*(U,U^-;\mathbb{K})$$

and therefore, by (4.32) and (4.34), the homomorphism $(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*$ in (4.27) is an isomorphism.

We may also prove the conclusion as follows. By the arguments at the middle of [Ch, pp. 51] we can use Künneth formula to arrive

$$\begin{aligned}C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau+\tilde{\beta}_\tau,0;\mathbb{K}) &= H_*(W_0,W_0^-;\mathbb{K})\otimes\\ &\qquad H_*(W_{11},W_{11}^-;\mathbb{K})\otimes H_*(W_{12},W_{12}^-;\mathbb{K}),\qquad(4.37)\\ C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}+\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau},0;\mathbb{K}) &= H_*(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-);\mathbb{K})\otimes\\ &\qquad H_*(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-);\mathbb{K})\otimes H_*(V_{12},V_{12}^-;\mathbb{K}).\qquad(4.38)\end{aligned}$$

Now $m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=m^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})$ and $m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=m^0_\tau(\tilde{\gamma})$ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}&(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*: H_*(W_0,W_0^-;\mathbb{K})\to H_*(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_0^-);\mathbb{K}),\\ &(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*: H_*(W_{11},W_{11}^-;\mathbb{K})\to H_*(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{11}^-);\mathbb{K})\end{aligned}$$

are isomorphisms. Since $\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}^-)\big)$ is a deformation retract of (V_{12},V_{12}^-) as above, it follows that

$$(\tilde{\psi}^k)_*: H_*\big(\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}),\tilde{\psi}^k(W_{12}^-);\mathbb{K}\big)\to H_*(V_{12},V_{12}^-;\mathbb{K})\qquad(4.39)$$

is an isomorphism. By (4.37) and (4.38) we get the proof of Lemma 4.6. □

For $(\widehat{W}_\tau,\widehat{W}_\tau^-)$ in (4.22) and $(\widehat{W}_{k\tau},\widehat{W}_{k\tau}^-)$ in (4.23), where the Gromoll-Meyer pairs (W_1,W_1^-) and (V,V^-) in (4.18) are also required to satisfy Lemma 4.6. Set

$$(W_\tau,W_\tau^-):=\big(\phi_\tau(\widehat{W}_\tau),\phi_\tau(\widehat{W}_\tau^-)\big)\quad\text{and}\quad(W_{k\tau},W_{k\tau}^-):=\big(\phi_{k\tau}(\widehat{W}_{k\tau}),\phi_{k\tau}(\widehat{W}_{k\tau}^-)\big).$$

Since $\phi_{k\tau}\circ\tilde{\psi}^k=\psi^k\circ\phi_\tau$, by (4.25) we have $(\psi^k(W_\tau),\psi^k(W_\tau^-))\subset(W_{k\tau},W_{k\tau}^-)$ and that the homomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_*: H_*(W_\tau,W_\tau^-;\mathbb{K})\to H_*(W_{k\tau},W_{k\tau}^-;\mathbb{K})$$

is an isomorphism. Consequently, (W_τ,W_τ^-) and $(W_{k\tau},W_{k\tau}^-)$ are desired topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs.

The other conclusions are also easily proved. So Theorem 4.4 holds. □

4.2. In this subsection we always assume: M is C^3-smooth, L is C^2-smooth and satisfies (L1)-(L4). Let $\gamma\in EH_\tau$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau^E$ on EH_τ, and

$$\phi_{k\tau}^E: EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},B_\rho^n(0))\to EH_{k\tau}\quad\text{and}\quad\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E=\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}\circ\phi_{k\tau}\tag{4.40}$$

be as in (3.29) and (3.32) for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$. They satisfy (3.30), i.e. $\phi_{k\tau}^E\circ\tilde{\psi}^k=\psi^k\circ\phi_\tau^E$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, where $\psi^k: EH_\tau\to EH_{k\tau}$ and

$$\tilde{\psi}^k: EW^{1,2}(S_\tau,\mathbb{R}^n)\to EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$$

are the iteration maps. Let $\tilde{\gamma}=(\phi_\tau^E)^{-1}(\gamma)$ and thus $\phi_{k\tau}^E(\tilde{\gamma}^k)=\gamma^k$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Suppose that γ^k and therefore $\tilde{\gamma}^k$ are also isolated. Denote by

$$C_q(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E,\tilde{\gamma}^k;\mathbb{K})=H_q\big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E,\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E^-;\mathbb{K}\big)$$

the critical module of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E$ at $\tilde{\gamma}^k$ via the relative singular homology with coefficients in $\mathbb{K}$, where $\big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E,\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E^-\big)$ is a Gromoll-Meyer pair via some pseduo-gradient vector field of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E$ near $\tilde{\gamma}^k$ in $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)&=M^0(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_E\oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_E^-\oplus M(\tilde{\gamma})_E^+\\&=M^0(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_E\oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_E^\perp\end{aligned}$$

be the orthogonal decomposition of the space $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$ according to the null, negative, and positive definiteness of the quadratic form $(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E)''(\tilde{\gamma})$. As above we can use the generalized Morse lemma to get a homeomorphism $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E$ from some open neighborhood $\tilde{U}_{k\tau}^E$ of 0 in $EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E(\tilde{U}_{k\tau}^E)\subset EW^{1,2}(S_{k\tau},\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E(0)=\tilde{\gamma}^k$, and a map $\tilde{h}_{k\tau}^E\in C^1\big(\tilde{U}_{k\tau}^E\cap M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E^0,M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E^\perp\big)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E\big(\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E(\eta+\xi)\big)&=\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E\big(\tilde{\gamma}^k+\eta+\tilde{h}_{k\tau}^E(\eta)\big)+\frac{1}{2}\big((\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E)''(\tilde{\gamma}^k)\xi,\xi\big)\\&\equiv\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}^E(\eta)+\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}^E(\xi)\end{aligned}$$

for any $\eta+\xi\in\tilde{U}_{k\tau}^E\cap(M(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E^0\oplus M(\tilde{\gamma}_k)_E^\perp)$, where $\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}^E$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}^E$ are respectively C^∞ and C^2 as noted below (4.12). Then $\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E$ induces isomorphisms on critical modules,

$$(\tilde{\Theta}_{k\tau}^E)_*: C_*(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}^E+\tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}^E,0;\mathbb{K})\cong C_*(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}^E,\tilde{\gamma}^k;\mathbb{K}).\tag{4.41}$$

Note that

$$(W(\gamma^k)_E,W^-(\gamma^k)_E):=\Big(\phi_{k\tau}^E\big(\tilde{W}(\tilde{\gamma}^k)_E\big),\phi_{k\tau}^E\big(\tilde{W}^-(\gamma^k)_E\big)\Big)\tag{4.42}$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ at γ^k. Define the critical modules

$$C_*(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau},\gamma^k;\mathbb{K}) := H_*\big(W(\gamma^k)_E, W^-(\gamma^k)_E;\mathbb{K}\big). \tag{4.43}$$

Then corresponding to Theorem 4.4 we have the following generalization of [LuW2, Lemma 4.1].

Theorem 4.7 *Let $\gamma\in EH_\tau$ be an isolated critical point of the functional $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ on EH_τ. If the iteration γ^k is also isolated for some $k\in\mathbb{N}$, and*

$$m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k)=m^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma)\quad\text{and}\quad m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k)=m^0_{1,\tau}(\gamma),$$

then for $c=\mathcal{L}^E_\tau(\gamma)$ and any $\epsilon>0$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ at $\gamma\in EH_\tau$ and of $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ at $\gamma^k\in EH_{k\tau}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&(W_\tau,W^-_\tau)\subset\big((\mathcal{L}^E_\tau)^{-1}[c-\epsilon,c+\epsilon],(\mathcal{L}^E_\tau)^{-1}(c-\epsilon)\big)\quad\textit{and}\\&(W_{k\tau},W^-_{k\tau})\subset\big((\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau})^{-1}[kc-k\epsilon,kc+k\epsilon],(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-k\epsilon)\big),\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(\psi^k(W_\tau),\psi^k(W^-_\tau))\subset(W_{k\tau},W^-_{k\tau}) \tag{4.44}$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k: EH_\tau\to EH_{k\tau}$ induces isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi^k)_*: C_*(\mathcal{L}^E_\tau,\gamma;\mathbb{K}) &:= H_*(W_\tau,W^-_\tau;\mathbb{K})\\ &\to C_*(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau},\gamma^k;\mathbb{K}) := H_*(W_{k\tau},W^-_{k\tau};\mathbb{K}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.45}$$

Specially, $(\psi^1)_*=id$, and $(\psi^k)_*\circ(\psi^l)_*=(\psi^{kl})_*$ if the iterations γ^l and γ^{kl} are also isolated, and

$$\left.\begin{aligned}m^-_{1,kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl})=m^-_{1,l\tau}(\gamma^l)=m^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma),\\ m^0_{1,kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl})=m^0_{1,l\tau}(\gamma^l)=m^0_{1,\tau}(\gamma)\end{aligned}\right\}.$$

4.3. Let us consider the case L is independent t. In this subsection we always assume: M is C^5-smooth, L is C^4-smooth and satisfies (L1)-(L3). The goal is to generalize [LoLu, Th.2.5] to the present general case. However, unlike the last two cases we cannot choose a local coordinate chart around a critical orbit. For $\tau>0$, let $S_\tau:=\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}=\{[s]_\tau\,|\,[s]_\tau=s+\tau\mathbb{Z},\ s\in\mathbb{R}\}$ and the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau: H_\tau(\alpha)\to\mathbb{R}$ be still defined by (1.14). By [Kl, Chp.2, §2.2], there exist equivariant and also isometric operations of S_τ-action on $H_\tau(\alpha)$ and $TH_\tau(\alpha)$:

$$\left.\begin{aligned}&[s]_\tau\cdot\gamma(t)=\gamma(s+t),\quad\forall[s]_\tau\in S_\tau,\ \gamma\in H_\tau(\alpha),\\&[s]_\tau\cdot\xi(t)=\xi(s+t),\quad\forall[s]_\tau\in S_\tau,\ \xi\in T_\gamma H_\tau(\alpha)\end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.46}$$

which are continuous, but not differentiable. Clearly, $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ is invariant under this action. Since under our assumptions each critical point γ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ is C^4-smooth, by [GM2, p. 499], the orbit $S_\tau\cdot\gamma$ is a C^3-submanifold in $H_\tau(\alpha)$. It is easily checked that $S_\tau\cdot\gamma$ is a C^3-smooth critical submanifold of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$. Seemingly, the theory of [Wa] cannot be applied to this case because the action of S_τ is only continuous. However, as pointed out in the second paragraph of [GM2, pp. 500] this theory still hold since critical orbits are smooth and S_τ acts by isometries.

For any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, there is a natural k-fold cover φ_k from $S_{k\tau}$ to S_τ defined by

$$\varphi_k:[s]_{k\tau}\mapsto[s]_\tau. \tag{4.47}$$

It is easy to check that the S_τ-action on $H_\tau(\alpha)$, the $S_{k\tau}$-action on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, and the k-th iteration map ψ^k defined above (3.9) satisfy:

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcl}([s]_\tau\cdot\gamma)^k &=& [s]_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k,\\ \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}([s]_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k) &=& k\mathcal{L}_\tau([s]_\tau\cdot\gamma)=k\mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)\end{array}\right\} \tag{4.48}$$

for all $\gamma\in H_\tau(\alpha)$, $k\in\mathbb{N}$, and $s\in\mathbb{R}$.

Let $\gamma\in H_\tau(\alpha)$ be a non-constant critical point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ with minimal period τ/m for some $m\in\mathbb{N}$. Denote by $\mathcal{O}=S_\tau\cdot\gamma=S_{\tau/m}\cdot\gamma$. It is a 1-dimensional C^3-submanifold diffeomorphic to the circle. Let $c=\mathcal{L}_\tau|_{\mathcal{O}}$. Assume that $\mathcal{O}$ is isolated. We may take a neighborhood U of $\mathcal{O}$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_\tau)\cap U=\mathcal{O}$. By (4.1) we have critical group $C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K})$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O}$. For every $s\in[0,\tau/m]$ the tangent space $T_{s\cdot\gamma}(S_\tau\cdot\gamma)$ is $\mathbb{R}(s\cdot\gamma)^\cdot$, and the fiber $N(\mathcal{O})_{s\cdot\gamma}$ at $s\cdot\gamma$ of the normal bundle $N(\mathcal{O})$ of $\mathcal{O}$ is a subspace of codimension 1 which is orthogonal to $(s\cdot\gamma)^\cdot$ in $T_{s\cdot\gamma}H_\tau(\alpha)$, i.e.

$$N(\mathcal{O})_{s\cdot\gamma}=\{\xi\in T_{s\cdot\gamma}H_\tau(\alpha)\,|\,\langle\langle\xi,(s\cdot\gamma)^\cdot\rangle\rangle_1=0\}.$$

Since $H_\tau(\alpha)$ is C^4-smooth and $\mathcal{O}$ is a C^3-smooth submanifold, $N(\mathcal{O})$ is C^2-smooth manifold. [1] Notice that $N(\mathcal{O})$ is invariant under the S_τ-actions in (4.20) and each $[s]_\tau$ gives an isometric bundle map

$$N(\mathcal{O})\to N(\mathcal{O}),\ (z,v)\mapsto([s]_\tau\cdot z,[s]_\tau\cdot v). \tag{4.49}$$

Under the present case it is easily checked that $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ satisfies the Assumption 7.1 on the page 71 of [Ch], that is, there exists $\epsilon>0$ such that

$$\sigma\big(\mathcal{L}''_\tau(x)\big)\cap([-\epsilon,\epsilon]\setminus\{0\})=\emptyset,\quad \dim\ker(\mathcal{L}''_\tau(x))=\text{constant} \tag{4.50}$$

for any $x\in\mathcal{O}$. Then Lemma 7.4 of [Ch, pp. 71] gives the orthogonal C^2-smooth bundle decomposition

$$N(\mathcal{O})=N(\mathcal{O})^+\oplus N(\mathcal{O})^-\oplus N(\mathcal{O})^0,\quad N(\mathcal{O})^*=P_*N(\mathcal{O}) \tag{4.51}$$

for $*=+,-,0$. Here $P_*:N(\mathcal{O})\to N(\mathcal{O})^*$, $*=+,0,-$, are orthogonal bundle projections. Each $N(\mathcal{O})^*$ is a C^2-smooth submanifold. It is not hard to check that $\mathcal{L}'_\tau$ and $\mathcal{L}''_\tau$ satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}'_\tau([s]_\tau\cdot x)=[s]_\tau\cdot\mathcal{L}'_\tau(x)\quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{L}''_\tau([s]_\tau\cdot x)([s]_\tau\cdot\xi)=[s]_\tau\cdot(\mathcal{L}''_\tau(x)(\xi))$$

for all $x\in H_\tau(\alpha)$, $\xi\in T_xH_\tau(\alpha)$ and $[s]_\tau\in S_\tau$. It follows that the bundle map (4.49) preserves the decomposition (4.51). In particular, we obtain

$$\big(\mathrm{rank}N(\mathcal{O})^-,\mathrm{rank}N(\mathcal{O})^0\big)=\big(m^-_\tau(x),m^0_\tau(x)-1\big)\quad\forall x\in\mathcal{O},$$

---

[1] This is the reason that we require higher smoothness of M and L.

where $m^-_\tau(x)$ and $m^0_\tau(x)$ are Morse index and nullity of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at x respectively. Define

$$\big(m^-_\tau(\mathcal{O}), m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O})\big) := \big(\mathrm{rank}N(\mathcal{O})^-, \mathrm{rank}N(\mathcal{O})^0\big). \tag{4.52}$$

Then

$$\big(m^-_\tau(\mathcal{O}), m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O})\big) = \big(m^-_\tau(x), m^0_\tau(x) - 1\big) \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{O}. \tag{4.53}$$

For a single point critical orbit $\mathcal{O} = \{\gamma\}$, i.e., γ is constant, we define

$$\big(m^-_\tau(\mathcal{O}), m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O})\big) := \big(m^-_\tau(\gamma), m^0_\tau(\gamma)\big). \tag{4.54}$$

Note that for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ the set

$$N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon) := \big\{(y, v) \in N(\mathcal{O}) | \, y \in \mathcal{O}, \, \|v\|_1 < \varepsilon\big\}$$

is contained in an open neighborhood of the zero section of the tangent bundle $TH_\tau(\alpha)$. By [Kl, Th.1.3.7, pp. 20] we have a C^2-embedding from $N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)$ to an open neighborhood of the diagonal of $H_\tau(\alpha) \times H_\tau(\alpha)$,

$$N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon) \to H_\tau(\alpha) \times H_\tau(\alpha), \ (y, v) \mapsto (y, \exp_y v),$$

where exp is the exponential map of the chosen Riemannian metric on M and $(\exp_y v)(t) = \exp_{y(t)} v(t) \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}$. This yields a C^2 diffeomorphism from $N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)$ to an open neighborhood $Q_\varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$ of $\mathcal{O}$,

$$\Psi_\tau : N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon) \to Q_\varepsilon(\mathcal{O}), \ \Psi_\tau(y, v)(t) = \exp_{y(t)} v(t) \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{4.55}$$

(Note that it is not the exponential map of the Levi-Civita connection derived the Riemannian metric $\langle\!\langle \, , \, \rangle\!\rangle_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha)$.) Clearly,

$$\Psi_\tau(y, 0) = y \ \forall y \in \mathcal{O} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_\tau([s]_\tau \cdot y, \, [s]_\tau \cdot v) = [s]_\tau \cdot \Psi_\tau(y, v) \tag{4.56}$$

for any $(y, v) \in N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)$ and $[s]_\tau \in S_\tau$. It follows that $Q_\varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$ is a S_τ-invariant neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}$, and that Ψ_τ is S_τ-equivariant. We also require $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $Q_\varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$ contains no other critical orbit besides $\mathcal{O}$, and that $\Psi_\tau\big(\{y\} \times N(\mathcal{O})_y(\varepsilon)\big)$ and $\mathcal{O}$ have a unique intersection point y (after identifying $\mathcal{O}$ with the zero section $N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)$). Then $\mathcal{L}_\tau \circ \Psi_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\varepsilon)}$ possesses y as an isolated critical point. Checking the proofs of Theorem 7.3 and Corollary 7.1 in [Ch, pp. 72], and replacing $f \circ \exp|_{\xi_x}$ and $\exp_x \phi_x$ therein by $\mathcal{L}_\tau \circ \Psi_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_x(\varepsilon)}$ and $\Psi_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_x(\varepsilon)} \circ \phi_x$ for $x \in \mathcal{O}$, one easily gets:

Lemma 4.8 *For sufficiently small $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon$, there exist a S_τ-equivariant homeomorphism Φ_τ from $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ to a S_τ-invariant open neighborhood $\Omega_\epsilon(\mathcal{O}) \subset Q_\varepsilon(\mathcal{O})$ of $\mathcal{O}$, and a C^1-map $h_\tau : N(\mathcal{O})^0(\epsilon) \to N(\mathcal{O})^+(\epsilon) \oplus N(\mathcal{O})^-(\epsilon)$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\tau \circ \Phi_\tau(y, v) = {} & \frac{1}{2}\big(\|P_+(y)v\|_1^2 - \|P_-(y)v\|_1^2\big) \\ & + \mathcal{L}_\tau \circ \Psi_\tau\big((y, P_0(y)v) + h_\tau(P_0(y)v)\big)\end{aligned}$$

for $(y, v) \in N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$, where P_* is as in (4.51).

Let $N(\mathcal{O})^\perp(\epsilon)=N(\mathcal{O})^+(\epsilon)\oplus N(\mathcal{O})^-(\epsilon)$ and write $v=v^0+v^\perp$. Set

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\Xi_\tau(y,v^\perp)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\|P_+(y)v\|_1^2-\|P_-(y)v\|_1^2\right),\\ \Upsilon_\tau(y,v^0)=\mathcal{L}_\tau\circ\Psi_\tau\big((y,P_0(y)v)+h_\tau(P_0(y)v)\big)\end{array}\right\}\tag{4.57}$$

for $(y,v)\in N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$. Then define $F_\tau:N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_\tau(y,v)=\mathcal{L}_\tau\circ\Phi_\tau(y,v)=\Upsilon_\tau(y,v^0)+\Xi_\tau(y,v^\perp)\tag{4.58}$$

for all $(y,v)\in N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$. (**Note**: Though we require the higher smoothness of M and L we do not know whether or not $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ has higher smoothness than order two unlike the special L considered in [Lo2]. Hence from [Ch, Th.7.3, pp. 72] we can only get that Φ_τ is a homeomorphism. However, $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ is a C^2-bundle [2] and therefore

$$\text{both } \Xi_\tau \text{ and } \Upsilon_\tau \text{ are } C^2.\tag{4.59}$$

By the local trivialization of $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ the final claim can be derived from Lemma 4.2 and the proofs of [Ch, Th.5.1, pp. 44] and [Ch, Th.7.3, pp. 72].) Clearly, both Υ_τ and Ξ_τ are also S_τ-invariant, and have the unique critical orbit $\mathcal{O}$ in $N(\mathcal{O})^\perp(\varepsilon)$ and $N(\mathcal{O})^0(\varepsilon)$ respectively. Since F_τ is C^2-smooth, we can follow [Wa] to construct a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{O}$ as a critical submanifold of F_τ on $N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)$,

$$(W(\mathcal{O}),W(\mathcal{O})^-).\tag{4.60}$$

(Note that different from [Wa] the present S_τ-action on $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ is only continuous; but the arguments there can still be carried out due to the special property of our S_τ-action in (4.20) and the definition of F_τ.) In the present case, for any $y\in\mathcal{O}$, $F_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}$ has a unique critical point y in $N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)$ (the fibre of disk bundle $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ at y), and

$$\big(W(\mathcal{O})_y,W(\mathcal{O})_y^-\big):=\big(W(\mathcal{O})\cap N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon),\,W(\mathcal{O})^-\cap N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)\big)\tag{4.61}$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $F_\tau|_{N_y(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)}$ at its isolated critical point y satisfying

$$\big(W(\mathcal{O})_{[s]_\tau\cdot y},\,W(\mathcal{O})^-_{[s]_\tau\cdot y}\big)=\big([s]_\tau\cdot W(\mathcal{O})_y,\,[s]_\tau\cdot W(\mathcal{O})_y^-\big)\tag{4.62}$$

for any $[s]_\tau\in S_\tau$ and $y\in\mathcal{O}$. Clearly,

$$\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)\big):=\big(\Phi_\tau(W(\mathcal{O})),\Phi_\tau(W(\mathcal{O})^-)\big)\tag{4.63}$$

is a topological Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O}$, which is also S_τ-invariant. Define

$$C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K}):=H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-;\mathbb{K}\big),\tag{4.64}$$

$$C_*(F_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K}):=H_*(W(\mathcal{O}),W(\mathcal{O})^-;\mathbb{K})\tag{4.65}$$

via the relative singular homology. Φ_τ induces an obvious isomorphism

$$(\Phi_\tau)_*:C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K})\cong C_*(F_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K}).\tag{4.66}$$

---

[2] The requirements of the higher smoothness of M and L is used to assure this.

Since the normal bundle $N(\mathcal{O})$ is differentiably trivial, it follows from [Wa, (2.13), (2.14)] (cf. also the shifting theorem in [GM1] and [Ch]) that for any $q \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_q(F_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \oplus_{j=0}^{q} \left[C_{q-j} \left(F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K} \right) \otimes H_j(S_\tau; \mathbb{K}) \right] \\ &\cong \oplus_{j=0}^{q} \left[C_{q-j-m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O})} \left(F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y^0(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K} \right) \otimes H_j(S_\tau; \mathbb{K}) \right] \\ &\cong C_{q-1-m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O})} \left(F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y^0(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K} \right) \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{O}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $C_{q-1-m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O})}\big(F_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y^0(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K}\big)$ is independent of the choice of $y \in \mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$. Taking $y = \gamma$ we obtain

$$C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\, S_\tau \cdot \gamma; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_{*-1-m_\tau^-(S_\tau \cdot \gamma)}\big(F_\tau|_{N(S_\tau \cdot \gamma)_\gamma^0(\epsilon)}, \gamma; \mathbb{K}\big). \tag{4.67}$$

Suppose that $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) = S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k$ is also an isolated critical orbit of the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Our purpose is to study the relations between critical groups $C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K})$ and $C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K})$.

Let $N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)$ be the normal bundle of $S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ and

$$N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)(\varepsilon) = \big\{(y, v) \in N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k) \,|\, y \in S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k,\ \|v\|_1 < \varepsilon\big\}.$$

Corresponding to (4.51) there exist natural orthogonal bundle decompositions

$$N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})) = N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+ \oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^- \oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^0, \tag{4.68}$$

$$N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\varepsilon) = N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\varepsilon) \oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-(\varepsilon) \oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^0(\varepsilon), \tag{4.69}$$

where $N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\varepsilon) = N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\varepsilon) \cap N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^*$ for $* = +, -, 0$.

It is not hard to check that

$$\psi^k(N(\mathcal{O})(\varepsilon)) \subset N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)(\sqrt{k}\varepsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi^k(N(\mathcal{O})^*(\varepsilon)) \subset N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)^* \tag{4.70}$$

for $* = +, 0, -$. By shrinking $\varepsilon > 0$ we have also a C^2-smooth S_τ-equivariant diffeomorphism from $N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)(\sqrt{k}\varepsilon)$ to a $S_{k\tau}$-invariant open neighborhood $Q_{\sqrt{k}\varepsilon}(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)$ of $S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k$,

$$\begin{gathered} \Psi_{k\tau} : N(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k)(\sqrt{k}\varepsilon) \to Q_{\sqrt{k}\varepsilon}(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k), \\ \Psi_{k\tau}(y, v)(t) = \exp_{y(t)} v(t)\ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{gathered} \tag{4.71}$$

With the same arguments as above Lemma 4.8, by furthermore shrinking $0 < \epsilon < \varepsilon$, there exist a $S_{k\tau}$-equivariant homeomorphism $\Phi_{k\tau}$ from from $N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$ to a $S_{k\tau}$-invariant open neighborhood $\Omega_{\sqrt{k}\epsilon}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})) \subset Q_{\sqrt{k}\varepsilon}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))$ of $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})$, and a C^1-map

$$h_{k\tau} : N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^0(\sqrt{k}\epsilon) \to N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\sqrt{k}\epsilon) \oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{k\tau} \circ \Phi_{k\tau}(y, v) = \Upsilon_{k\tau}(y, v^0) + \Xi_{k\tau}(y, v^\perp) \tag{4.72}$$

for $(y,v)\in N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$, where $v^\perp\in N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^\perp(\sqrt{k}\epsilon) = N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)\oplus N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$ and

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}\Xi_{k\tau}(y,v^\perp)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\|v^+\|_1^2-\|v^-\|_1^2\right),\\ \Upsilon_{k\tau}(y,v^0)=\mathcal{L}_\tau\circ\Psi_\tau\big((y,v^0)+h(y,v^0)\big)\end{array}\right\}\tag{4.73}$$

have the similar properties to (4.59). As in (4.58) we define a $S_{k\tau}$-invariant, C^2-smooth function $F_{k\tau}: N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$F_{k\tau}(y,v)=\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(\Phi_{k\tau}(y,v))=\Upsilon_{k\tau}(y,v^0)+\Xi_{k\tau}(y,v^\perp).\tag{4.74}$$

It has the unique critical orbit $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})$ in $N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$. Note that (4.55) and (4.71) imply

$$\Psi_{k\tau}\circ\psi^k=\psi^k\circ\Psi_\tau.\tag{4.75}$$

As in [LoLu, Prop. 2.3], we can suitably modify the proof of [Lo2, Lem. 3.3] to get:

Lemma 4.9 *Suppose that $m^0_{k\tau}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))=m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O})$. Then:*

(i) *The maps h_τ and $h_{k\tau}$ satisfy*

$$h_{k\tau}(\psi^k(p))=\psi^k(h_\tau(p)),\quad \forall p=(y,v)\in N(\mathcal{O})^0(\epsilon).\tag{4.76}$$

(ii) *The homeomorphisms Φ_τ and $\Phi_{k\tau}$ satisfy*

$$\Phi_{k\tau}\circ\psi^k=\psi^k\circ\Phi_\tau\tag{4.77}$$

as maps from $N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$ to $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$.

(iii) *For $q\in N(\mathcal{O})^0(\epsilon)$, $p\in N(\mathcal{O})^\perp(\epsilon)$, there hold*

$$\Upsilon_{k\tau}(\psi^k(q))=k\Upsilon_\tau(q),\qquad \Xi_{k\tau}(\psi^k(p))=k\Xi_\tau(p).\tag{4.78}$$

Indeed, the key in the proof of [Lo2, Lem. 3.3] is that the maps h_τ and $h_{k\tau}$ are uniquely determined by the implicit function theorem as showed in the proof of the Generalized Morse lemma [Ch, pp. 44]. It follows from (4.78) that

$$F_{k\tau}\circ\psi^k=kF_\tau.\tag{4.79}$$

By the construction of the Gromoll-Meyer pair in [Wa] we can construct such a pair of $F_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})$ on $N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$, $(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))$ such that

$$(\psi^k(W(\mathcal{O})),\psi^k(W(\mathcal{O})^-))\subset(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-)\tag{4.80}$$

for the pair $(W(\mathcal{O}),W(\mathcal{O})^-)$ in (4.60). Set

$$\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big):=\big(\Phi_{k\tau}(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))),\Phi_{k\tau}(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-)\big),\tag{4.81}$$

which is a topological Gromoll-Meyer pair, and

$$C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\psi^k(\mathcal{O});\mathbb{K}):=H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-;\mathbb{K}\big),\tag{4.82}$$

$$C_*(F_{k\tau},\psi^k(\mathcal{O});\mathbb{K}):=H_*\big(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-;\mathbb{K}\big).\tag{4.83}$$

It follows from (4.77) and (4.80) that

$$\big(\psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)\big) \subset \big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big) \tag{4.84}$$

and that ψ^k induces homomorphisms

$$(\psi^k)_*: C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}), \tag{4.85}$$

$$(\psi^k)_*: C_*(F_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(F_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \tag{4.86}$$

satisfying

$$(\psi^k)_* \circ (\Phi_\tau)_* = (\Phi_{k\tau})_* \circ (\psi^k)_* \tag{4.87}$$

because of (4.77). By (4.66) and the isomorphism

$$(\Phi_{k\tau})_*: C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \cong C_*(F_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \tag{4.88}$$

we only need to prove:

Lemma 4.10 *The Gromoll-Meyer pairs in (4.80) can be chosen so that the homomorphism in (4.86) is an isomorphism provided that*

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})) = m^-_\tau(\mathcal{O}) \quad \text{and} \quad m^0_{k\tau}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})) = m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O}). \tag{4.89}$$

Proof. By (4.58), (4.72) and (4.74) we have

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} C_*(F_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) = C_*(\Upsilon_\tau + \Xi_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}), \\ C_*(F_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) = C_*(\Upsilon_{k\tau} + \Xi_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \end{array}\right\} \tag{4.90}$$

We shall imitate the proof of Lemma 4.6 to prove that the homomorphism

$$(\psi^k)_*: C_*(\Upsilon_\tau + \Xi_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \to C_*(\Upsilon_{k\tau} + \Xi_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \tag{4.91}$$

is an isomorphism.

Let $(W_0(\mathcal{O}), W_0^-(\mathcal{O}))$ be a Gromoll-Meyer pair of Υ_τ at $\mathcal{O} \subset N(\mathcal{O})^0(\epsilon)$. Since (4.89) implies that $\psi^k: N(\mathcal{O})^0(\epsilon) \to N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^0(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$ is a bundle isomorphism. Hence

$$\big(\psi^k(W_0(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(W_0^-(\mathcal{O}))\big)$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\Upsilon_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) \subset N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^0(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$. For $j = 1, k$ let us write $N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^\perp = N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^+ \oplus N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-$ and

$$N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^\perp(\sqrt{j}\epsilon) = N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^+(\sqrt{j}\epsilon) \oplus N(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-(\sqrt{j}\epsilon),$$
$$\Xi_{j\tau}(y, v^\perp) = \Xi^+_{j\tau}(y, v^+) + \Xi_{j\tau}(y, v^-), \quad v^\perp = v^+ + v^-.$$

By (4.78), for $p \in N(\mathcal{O})^\pm(\epsilon)$, there hold

$$\Xi^\pm_{k\tau}(\psi^k(p)) = k\Xi^\pm_\tau(p). \tag{4.92}$$

Let $(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}), W_{11}^-(\mathcal{O}))$ be a Gromoll-Meyer pair of Ξ^-_τ at $\mathcal{O} \subset N(\mathcal{O})^-(\epsilon)$. Then

$$(\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(W_{11}^-(\mathcal{O})) \tag{4.93}$$

is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\Xi^-_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})\subset N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$ because (4.89) implies that $\psi^k: N(\mathcal{O})^-(\epsilon)\to N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$ is a bundle isomorphism. For $0<\delta\ll\epsilon$, set

$$\begin{aligned}
&W_{12}:=\{(y,v)\in N(\mathcal{O})^+(\epsilon)\,|\,\|v\|_\tau\le\delta\,\},\\
&W^-_{12}:=\{(y,v)\in N(\mathcal{O})^+(\epsilon)\,|\,\|v\|_\tau=\delta\,\},\\
&V_{12}:=\{(y,v)\in N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\epsilon)\,|\,\|v\|_{k\tau}\le\sqrt{k}\delta\,\},\\
&V^-_{12}:=\{(y,v)\in N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\epsilon)\,|\,\|v\|_{k\tau}=\sqrt{k}\delta\,\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then (W_{12},W^-_{12}) (resp. (V_{12},V^-_{12})) is a Gromoll-Meyer pair of Ξ^+_τ (resp. $\Xi^+_{k\tau}$) at $\mathcal{O}\subset N(\mathcal{O})^+(\epsilon)$ (resp. $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})\subset N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^+(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$), and that

$$\Big(\psi^k(W_{12}),\psi^k(W^-_{12})\Big)\subset(V_{12},V^-_{12}). \tag{4.94}$$

By Lemma 5.1 on the page 51 of [Ch], we may take

$$\begin{aligned}
&W_1(\mathcal{O}):=W_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{12},\\
&W^-_1(\mathcal{O}):=(W_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W^-_{12})\cup(W^-_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{12}),\\
&V:=\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V_{12},\\
&V^-:=(\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V^-_{12})\cup(\psi^k(W^-_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V_{12})
\end{aligned}$$

and get a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\Upsilon_\tau+\Xi_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O}\subset N(\mathcal{O})(\epsilon)$, $(W(\mathcal{O}),W(\mathcal{O})^-)$, where

$$W(\mathcal{O}):=W_0(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{12}, \tag{4.95}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
W^-(\mathcal{O}):=&\big(W_0(\mathcal{O})\oplus[(W_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W^-_{12})\cup(W^-_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{12})]\big)\\
&\cup\big(W^-_0(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{11}(\mathcal{O})\oplus W_{12}\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.96}$$

Therefore

$$C_*(\Upsilon_\tau+\Xi_\tau,0;\mathbb{K})=H_*(W(\mathcal{O}),W^-(\mathcal{O});\mathbb{K}). \tag{4.97}$$

Similarly, we have a Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\Upsilon_{k\tau}+\Xi_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})\subset N(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))(\sqrt{k}\epsilon)$, $(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})):=&\,\psi^k(W_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V_{12},\\
W^-(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})):=&\big(\psi^k(W_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus[(\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V^-_{12})\cup(\psi^k(W^-_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V_{12})]\big)\\
&\cup\big(\psi^k(W^-_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus V_{12}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$C_*(\Upsilon_{k\tau}+\Xi_{k\tau},\psi^k(\mathcal{O});\mathbb{K})=H_*(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),W^-(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}));\mathbb{K}). \tag{4.98}$$

Note that $\psi^k(W(\mathcal{O}))=\psi^k(W_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{12})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi^k(W^-(\mathcal{O}))=&\big(\psi^k(W_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus(\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W^-_{12}))\\
&\cup(\psi^k(W^-_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{12}))\big)\\
&\cup\big(\psi^k(W^-_0(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{11}(\mathcal{O}))\oplus\psi^k(W_{12})\big).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.99}$$

Since $\psi^k : N^+(\mathcal{O}) \to N^+(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))$ is a continuous bundle injection, by (4.94) and the constructions of (V_{12}, V_{12}^-) and (W_{12}, W_{12}^-) above (4.94) it is readily checked that $\big(\psi^k(W_{12}), \psi^k(W_{12}^-)\big)$ is a deformation retract of (V_{12}, V_{12}^-). It follows that

$$\big(\psi^k(W(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(W^-(\mathcal{O}))\big) \subset \big(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W^-(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))\big)$$

is a deformation retract of $\big(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W^-(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))\big)$. Hence

$$(\psi^k)_* : H_*(W(\mathcal{O}), W^-(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) \to H_*\big(W(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), W^-(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})); \mathbb{K}\big)$$

is an isomorphism. Therefore, by (4.97) and (4.98), the homomorphism $(\psi^k)_*$ in (4.91) is an isomorphism. Lemma 4.10 is proved. $\Box$.

When γ is constant, i.e. $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$ is an isolated critical point, this case has been proved in Theorem 4.4. Combing this with Lemma 4.10, and (4.66) and (4.88) we get

Theorem 4.11 *For an isolated critical submanifold $\mathcal{O} = \mathrm{S}_\tau \cdot \gamma$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ in $H_\tau(\alpha)$, suppose that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the critical submanifold $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{S}_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k$ of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ is also isolated, and that (4.89) is satisfied, i.e. $m_{k\tau}^-(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k) = m_\tau^-(S_\tau \cdot \gamma)$ and $m_{k\tau}^0(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma^k) = m_\tau^0(S_\tau \cdot \gamma)$. Then for $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau|_{\mathcal{O}}$ and small $\epsilon > 0$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O} \subset H_\tau(\alpha)$ and of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O}) \subset H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$*

$$\begin{aligned}&(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-) \subset \big((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}[c-\epsilon, c+\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-\epsilon)\big) \quad \text{and} \\ &\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big) \subset \big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}[kc-k\epsilon, kc+k\epsilon], (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-k\epsilon)\big),\end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\big(\psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})), \psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)\big) \subset \big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big)$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k : H_\tau(\alpha) \to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ induces an isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_*^k : C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) &:= H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}\big) \\ \longrightarrow C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K}) &:= H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-; \mathbb{K}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.12 *Suppose that $C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0$ for $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$. Then*

$$q - 2n \le q - 1 - m_\tau^0(\mathcal{O}) \le m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O}) \le q - 1 \tag{4.100}$$

if $\mathcal{O}$ is not a single point critical orbit, i.e. γ is not constant, and

$$q - 2n \le q - m_\tau^0(\mathcal{O}) \le m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O}) \le q \tag{4.101}$$

otherwise.

Proof. If γ is not a constant solution, it follows from (4.66) and (4.67) that

$$C_{q-1-m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O})}\big(F_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_\gamma^0(\epsilon)}, \gamma; \mathbb{K}\big) \cong C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0. \tag{4.102}$$

Since γ is an isolated critical point of $F_\tau|_{N(\mathcal{O})_\gamma^0(\epsilon)}$ in $N(\mathcal{O})_\gamma^0(\epsilon)$ and $N(\mathcal{O})_\gamma^0(\epsilon)$ has dimension $m_\tau^0(\mathcal{O})$, we get

$$0 \le q - 1 - m_\tau^-(\mathcal{O}) \le \dim N(\mathcal{O})_\gamma^0(\epsilon) = m_\tau^0(\mathcal{O}). \tag{4.103}$$

By (4.53), $m^0_\tau(\mathcal{O}) = m^0_\tau(\gamma) - 1 \le 2n-1$. (4.100) easily follows from this and (4.103).

If γ is a constant solution, i.e. $\mathcal{O} = \{\gamma\}$, using the isomorphisms above (4.11) and (4.24) we derive

$$C_q(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau + \tilde{\beta}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_q(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_\tau, \tilde{\gamma}; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\gamma} = (\phi_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma).$$

On the other hand, (3.11) and the shifting theorem ([GM1] and [Ch, pp.50]) imply

$$C_q(\alpha_\tau + \beta_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_{q - m^-_\tau(\gamma)}(\tilde{\alpha}_\tau, 0; \mathbb{K}).$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_\tau$ is defined on a manifold of dimension $m^0_\tau(\gamma) \le 2n$, (4.101) follow immediately. □

Lemma 4.13 *Suppose that $C_q(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0$ for $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$. If either $\mathcal{O}$ is not a single point critical orbit and $q > 1$, or $\mathcal{O}$ is a single point critical orbit and $q > 0$, then each point in $\mathcal{O}$ is non-minimal saddle point.*

Proof. When $\mathcal{O}$ is a single point critical orbit and $q > 0$, the conclusion follows from [Ch, Ex.1, pp.33]. Now assume that $\mathcal{O}$ is not a single point critical orbit and $q > 1$. For any $y \in \mathcal{O}$, by (4.66) and the formula above (4.67) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \ne C_q(F_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) &\cong \oplus_{j=0}^q \left[C_{q-j}\left(F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K} \right) \otimes H_j(S_\tau; \mathbb{K}) \right] \\ &\cong C_{q-1}\left(F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}, y; \mathbb{K} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since y is an isolated critical point of $F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}$ and $q - 1 > 0$, we derive from [Ch, Ex.1, pp.33] that y is a non-minimal saddle point of $F_\tau \Big|_{N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)}$. This implies that y is a non-minimal saddle point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on the submanifold $\Psi_\tau(N(\mathcal{O})_y(\epsilon)) \subset H_\tau(\alpha)$ (and therefore on $H_\tau(\alpha)$). □

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

5.1. Proof of (i). For any $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, let $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$ denote the Hilbert manifold of $W^{1,2}$-loops $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z} \to M$ representing α^k. Since $H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k); \mathbb{K}) = H_r(C(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k); \mathbb{K})$ and the inclusion $H_\tau(\alpha^k) \hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M; \alpha^k)$ is a homotopy equivalence,

$$\text{rank} H_r(H_\tau(\alpha^k); \mathbb{K}) \ne 0 \quad \forall \tau, k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.1}$$

By [Be] the functional $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on the Hilbert manifold $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$ is C^2-smooth, bounded below, satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, and all critical points of it have finite Morse indexes and nullities. In particular, the critical set $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \alpha^k)$ of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$ is nonempty because $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ can attain the minimal value on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$. Clearly, for any $\tau, k \in \mathbb{N}$ we may assume that each critical point of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$ is isolated. By contradiction we make:

Assumption $F(\alpha)$: (i) *For any given integer* $k>0$*, the system (1.6) only possesses finitely many distinct,* k*-periodic solutions representing* α^k, (ii) *there exists an integer* $k_0>1$ *such that for each integer* $k>k_0$*, any* k*-periodic solution* $\tilde{\gamma}$ *of the system (1.6) representing* α^k *must be an iteration of some* l*-periodic solution* γ *of the system (1.6) representing* α^l *with* $l\le k_0$ *and* $k=ls$ *for some* $s\in\mathbb{N}$*.*

Under this assumption we have integer periodic solutions $\hat{\gamma}_i$ of the system (1.6) of period $\tau_i\le k_0$ and representing α^{τ_i}, $i=1,\cdots,p$, such that for each integer $k>k_0$ any integer k-periodic solution γ of the system (1.6) representing α^k must be an iteration of some $\hat{\gamma}_i$, i.e. $\gamma=\hat{\gamma}_i^l$ for some $l\in\mathbb{N}$ with $l\tau_i=k$. Set $\tau:=k_0!$ (the factorial of k_0) and $\gamma_i=\hat{\gamma}_i^{\tau/\tau_i}$, $i=1,\cdots,p$. Then each γ_i is a τ-periodic solution of the system (1.6) representing α^τ. We conclude

Claim 5.1 *For any* $k\in\mathbb{N}$*, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\alpha^{k\tau})=\{\,\gamma_j^k\ \big|\ 1\le j\le p\,\}. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Let $\gamma\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\alpha^{k\tau})$. Since $k\tau>k_0$, by (ii) in Assumption $F(\alpha)$ we have $\gamma=\hat{\gamma}_i^l$ for some $l\in\mathbb{N}$ with $l\tau_i=k\tau$. Hence $\gamma=\hat{\gamma}_i^l=(\hat{\gamma}_i)^{k\tau/\tau_i}=(\hat{\gamma}_i^{\tau/\tau_i})^k=\gamma_i^k$. □

Since M is not assumed to be orientable, it is possible that the pullback bundle $\gamma_j^*TM\to\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}$ is not trivial. However, each 2-fold iteration γ_j^2, $(\gamma_j^2)^*TM\to\mathbb{R}/2\tau\mathbb{Z}$ is always trivial. Note that (5.2) implies

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{2k\tau},\alpha^{2k\tau})=\{\,(\gamma_j^2)^k=\gamma_j^{2k}\ \big|\ 1\le j\le p\,\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Hence replacing $\{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_p\}$ by $\{\gamma_1^2\cdots\gamma_p^2\}$ we may **assume**:

$$\gamma_j^*TM\to\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z},\quad j=1,\cdots,p,\quad \text{are all trivial.} \tag{5.4}$$

Lemma 5.2 *For each* $k\in\mathbb{N}$ *there exists* $\gamma_k'\in\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\alpha^{k\tau})$ *such that*

$$C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\gamma_k';\mathbb{K})\ne 0\quad\text{and}\quad r-2n\le r-m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma_k')\le m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma_k')\le r.$$

Proof. Let $c_1<\cdots<c_l$ be all critical values of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$, $l\le p$. Then $kc_1<\cdots<kc_l$ are all critical values of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$, $k=1,2,\cdots$. In particular, $\inf\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}=kc_1$ because $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ is bounded below and satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.

By (5.1), $\mathrm{rank}H_r(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau});\mathbb{K})\ge m$ for some $m\in\mathbb{N}$. Recall that a subset of an abelian group is defined to be **linearly independent** if it satisfies the usual condition with integer coefficients, cf. [Ma, pp. 87]. Take linearly independent elements of $H_r(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau});\mathbb{K})$, $\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_m$, and singular cycles $Z_1,\cdots,Z_m$ of $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ which represent them. Let S be a compact set containing the supports of $Z_1,\cdots,Z_m$. Then $S\subset(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b:=\{\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}\le b\}$ for a sufficiently large regular value $b>kc_l$. Note that $Z_1,\cdots,Z_m$ are also singular cycles of $(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b$, and that non-trivial $\mathbb{K}$-linear combination of them cannot be homologous to zero in $(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b$ (otherwise the same combination is homologous to zero in $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$.) Hence we get

$$\mathrm{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b;\mathbb{K})\ge m>0.$$

Take the regular values of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$, $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_l = b$ such that $kc_i \in (a_{i-1}, a_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$. By Theorem 4.2 of [Ch, pp. 23],

$$H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_i}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_{i-1}}; \mathbb{K}) \cong \bigoplus_{\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(z)=kc_i,\, d\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(z)=0} C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, z; \mathbb{K}). \tag{5.5}$$

Since each critical point has finite Morse index, it follows from the generalized Morse lemma that each group $C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, z; \mathbb{K})$ has finite rank, and therefore that

$$\text{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_i}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_{i-1}}; \mathbb{K}) < +\infty,\ i = 1, \cdots, l.$$

By the arguments on the page 38 of [Ch] and the fact (b) on the page 87 of [Ma], for a triple $Z \subset Y \subset X$ of topological spaces it holds that

$$\text{rank}H_q(X, Z; \mathbb{K}) \le \text{rank}H_q(X, Y; \mathbb{K}) + \text{rank}H_q(X, Y; \mathbb{K})$$

if these three numbers are finite. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < m &\le \text{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b; \mathbb{K}) \\ &= \text{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_l}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_0}; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^{m} \text{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_i}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_{i-1}}; \mathbb{K}) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{rank}H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_i}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_{i-1}}; \mathbb{K}) \ge 1$ for some i. By (5.5) we get a $\gamma'_k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^{k\tau})$ such that $\text{rank}C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma'_k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0$ and thus $C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma'_k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0$. Noting (5.4), we can use the isomorphism above (4.11) to derive

$$C_r(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}'_k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{\gamma}'_k = (\phi_{k\tau})^{-1}(\gamma'_k).$$

Replaceing $\tilde{\gamma}^k$ in (4.12) by $\tilde{\gamma}'_k$, and using the isomorphism above (4.24), (3.11) and the shifting theorem ([GM1] and [Ch, pp.50]) we get

$$C_{r-m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma'_k)}(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_r(\alpha_{k\tau} + \beta_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \cong C_r(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}'_k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0.$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ is defined on a manifold of dimension $m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma'_k) \le 2n$, the desired inequalities follow immediately. □

Lemma 5.3 *Without Assumption* $F(\alpha)$, *let* γ *be an isolated critical point of* $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ *in* $H_\tau(\alpha^\tau)$ *such that* $\gamma^*TM \to S_\tau$ *is trivial. For every integer* $q \ge n+1$, *let* $k(q,\gamma) = 1$ *if* $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) = 0$, *and* $k(q,\gamma) = \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma)}$ *if* $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) \ne 0$. *Assume that* γ^k *is also an isolated critical point of* $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ *for some integer* $k > k(q,\gamma)$. *Then*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Proof. Let $\phi_{k\tau} : W^{1,2}(S_\tau, B^n_\rho(0)) \to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ be a coordinate chart on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ around γ^k as in (3.8). Set $\tilde{\gamma} = (\phi_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma)$. Then $\tilde{\gamma}^k = (\phi_{k\tau})^{-1}(\gamma^k)$ and $m^-_\tau(\tilde{\gamma}) =$

$m^-_\tau(\gamma)$, $m^0_\tau(\tilde{\gamma}) = m^0_\tau(\gamma)$ and $m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) = m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$ and $m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k) = m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.2, by the isomorphisms above (4.11) and (4.24) we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) &\cong C_r(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong C_q(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau} + \tilde{\beta}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\cong C_{q-m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)}(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}$ is defined on a manifold of dimension $m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le 2n$.

If $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) = 0$, by (3.2) (or (3.18)) we have $0 \le m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le n - m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$. Hence

$$q - m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \ge q - (n - m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)) \ge 1 + m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k).$$

This gives $C_{q-m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)}(\tilde{\alpha}_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) = 0$.

If $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) > 0$, by (3.2) (or (3.18)) we have $k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) - n \le m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)$ and thus

$$q - m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) \le q - (k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) - n) = q + n - k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma) < 0$$

if $k > \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma)}$. This also leads to $C_{q-m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k)}(\alpha_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) = 0$. □

So we immediately get the following generalization of Lemma 4.2 in [Lo2].

Corollary 5.4 *Under Assumption $F(\alpha)$, for every integer $q \ge n+1$ there exists a constant $k_0(q) > 0$ such that for every integer $k \ge k_0(q)$ there holds*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, y; \mathbb{K}) = 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^{k\tau}).$$

Here $k_0(q) = 1$ if $\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma_j) = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le p$, and

$$k_0(q) = 1 + \max\left\{ \left[\frac{q+n}{\hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma_j)}\right] \;\Big|\; \hat{m}^-_\tau(\gamma_j) \ne 0,\, 1 \le j \le p \right\}$$

otherwise. ($[s]$ denotes the largest integer less than or equal to s).

Indeed, by (5.2) we may assume $y = \gamma_j^k$ for some $1 \le j \le p$. Then Lemma 5.3 yields the desired conclusion.

Clearly, if $r \ge n+1$ then Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 immediately give a contradiction. Theorem 1.1(i) is proved in this case.

`In the following we consider the case` $r = n$.

Under Assumption $F(\alpha)$ we apply Lemma 5.2 to all $k \in \{2^m \,|\, m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$ to get an infinite subsequence Q of $\{2^m \,|\, m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$, some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and an $\gamma \in \{\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_p\}$ such that $C_n(\mathcal{L}_{kl\tau}, \gamma^{kl}; \mathbb{Z}_2) \ne 0$, $m^-_{kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl}) = m^-_{l\tau}(\gamma^l)$ and $m^0_{kl\tau}(\gamma^{kl}) = m^0_{l\tau}(\gamma^l)$ for any $k \in Q$. In order to save notations we **always assume** $l = 1$ in the following. That is, we have $\gamma^k \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^{k\tau})$ with

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} C_n(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0, \\ m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^-_\tau(\gamma), \quad m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^0_\tau(\gamma) \end{array}\right\} \tag{5.7}$$

for any $k\in Q$. By Corollary 5.4 there exists $k_0>0$ such that for any $\gamma\in\{\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_p\}$,

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\gamma^k;\mathbb{K})=0\quad\forall k\in Q(k_0):=\{k\in Q\,|\,k\ge k_0\}.\tag{5.8}$$

To avoid the finite energy homology introduced and used in [Lo2] we need to improve the proof and conclusions of Theorem 4.3 in [Lo2]. Let $c=\mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)$. Take $\epsilon>0$ sufficiently small so that for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$ the interval $[k(c-3\epsilon),k(c+3\epsilon)]$ contains an unique critical value kc of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}\big(\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\alpha^{k\tau})\big)\cap[k(c-3\epsilon),k(c+3\epsilon)]=\{kc\}.$$

By Theorem 4.4, for each integer $k\in Q$ we may choose topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at γ and $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at γ^k, $\big(W(\gamma),W(\gamma)^-\big)$ and $\big(W(\gamma^k),W(\gamma^k)^-\big)$, such that

$$\big(W(\gamma),W(\gamma)^-\big)\subset\big((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}([c-2\epsilon,c+2\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-2\epsilon)\big),\tag{5.9}$$

$$\big(W(\gamma^k),W(\gamma^k)^-\big)\subset\big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}([kc-2k\epsilon,kc+2k\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-2k\epsilon)\big),\tag{5.10}$$

$$\big(\psi^k(W(\gamma)),\psi^k(W(\gamma)^-)\big)\subset\big(W(\gamma^k),W(\gamma^k)^-\big)\tag{5.11}$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k:H_\tau(\alpha)\to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ induces isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}(\psi^k)_*:C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\gamma;\mathbb{K})&=H_*\big(W(\gamma),W(\gamma)^-;\mathbb{K}\big)\\&\to C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\gamma^k;\mathbb{K})=H_*\big(W(\gamma^k),W(\gamma^k)^-;\mathbb{K}\big).\end{aligned}$$

For $j=1,k$, denote by the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{h}_1^j&:\big(W(\gamma^j),W(\gamma^j)^-\big)\hookrightarrow\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c-2\epsilon)}\big),\\ \mathbf{h}_2^j&:\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c-2\epsilon)}\big)\hookrightarrow\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)}\big),\\ \mathbf{h}_3^j&:\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)}\big)\hookrightarrow\big(H_{j\tau},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Hereafter B° denote the interior of B without special statements. The arguments above [Lo2, Th.4.3] show that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{h}_2^j\circ\mathbf{h}_1^j)_*&:H_*\big(W(\gamma^j),W(\gamma^j)^-;\mathbb{K}\big)\to H_*\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)};\mathbb{K}\big),\\(\mathbf{h}_3^j)_*&:H_*\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\epsilon)},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)};\mathbb{K}\big)\to H_*\big(\big(H_{j\tau},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\epsilon)};\mathbb{K}\big)\end{aligned}$$

are monomorphisms on homology modules. For $j=1,k$, we have also inclusions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_j&:\big(W(\gamma^j),W(\gamma^j)^-\big)\hookrightarrow\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}([jc-2j\epsilon,jc+2j\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}(jc-2j\epsilon)\big),\\ \mathbf{J}_j&:\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}([jc-2j\epsilon,jc+2j\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}(jc-2j\epsilon)\big)\hookrightarrow\big(H_{j\tau},(\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{jc-j\epsilon}\big).\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$\mathbf{J}_j\circ\mathbf{I}_j=\mathbf{h}_3^j\circ\mathbf{h}_2^j\circ\mathbf{h}_1^j,\quad j=1,k.\tag{5.12}$$

By (5.11), we have also

$$\psi^k\circ\mathbf{I}_1=\mathbf{I}_k\circ\psi^k$$

as maps from $\big(W(\gamma),W(\gamma)^-\big)$ to $\big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}([kc-2k\epsilon,kc+2k\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-2k\epsilon)\big)$. So we get the following result, which is a slightly strengthened version of [Lo2, Th. 4.3] in the case $M=T^n$.

Proposition 5.5 *Under Assumption $F(\alpha)$, there exist a periodic solution γ of (1.6) of integer period τ and representing α, a large integer $k_0 > 0$, an infinite integer set Q containing 1, and a small $\epsilon > 0$ having properties: For any $k \in Q(k_0) := \{k \in Q \,|\, k \geq k_0\}$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs $\big(W(\gamma), W(\gamma)^-\big)$ and $\big(W(\gamma^k), W(\gamma^k)^-\big)$ satisfying (5.9)-(5.11) such that for the inclusion*

$$j_{k\tau} = \mathbf{h}_3^k \circ \mathbf{h}_2^k \circ \mathbf{h}_1^k : \big(W(\gamma^k), W(\gamma^k)^-\big) \to \big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau}), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{\circ}_{k(c-\epsilon)}\big)$$

the following diagram holds:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \neq C_n(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{(\psi^k)_*} C_n(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{K}) \\ &\xrightarrow{(j_{k\tau})_*} H_n\big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau}), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{\circ}_{k(c-\epsilon)}; \mathbb{K}\big) \equiv \mathcal{H}_k, \qquad (5.13)\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)$, $(\psi^k)_*$ is an isomorphism, and $(j_{k\tau})_*$ is a monomorphism among the singular homology modules. In particular, if ω is a generator of $C_n(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \gamma; \mathbb{K}) = H_n\left(W(\gamma), W(\gamma)^-; \mathbb{K}\right)$, then

$$(j_{k\tau})_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega) \neq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_k, \qquad (5.14)$$

$$\begin{aligned}(j_{k\tau})_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega) &= (\mathbf{J}_k)_* \circ (\mathbf{I}_k)_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega) \\ &= (\mathbf{J}_k)_* \circ (\psi^k)_* \circ (\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_k. \qquad (5.15)\end{aligned}$$

It is (5.15) that helps us avoiding to use the finite energy homology.

The notion of a C^1-smooth singular simplex in Hilbert manifolds can be defined as on page 252 of [Ma].

Proposition 5.6 *For $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$, $q \geq 0$, and a C^1-smooth q-simplex*

$$\eta : (\Delta_q, \partial\Delta_q) \to \left(H_\tau(\alpha^\tau), (\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{\circ}_{c-\epsilon}\right),$$

there exists an integer $k(\eta) > 0$ such that for every integer $k \geq k(\eta)$, the q-simplex

$$\eta^k \equiv \psi^k(\eta) : (\Delta_q, \partial\Delta_q) \to \Big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau}), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{\circ}_{k(c-\epsilon)}\Big)$$

is homotopic to a singular q-simplex

$$\eta_k : (\Delta_q, \partial\Delta_q) \to \Big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{\circ}_{k(c-\epsilon)}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{\circ}_{k(c-\epsilon)}\Big) \qquad (5.16)$$

with $\eta^k = \eta_k$ on $\partial\Delta_q$ and the homotopy fixes $\eta^k|_{\partial\Delta_q}$.

This is an analogue of [BK, Th.1], firstly proved by Y. Long [Lo2, Prop. 5.1] in the case $M = T^n$. Proposition 5.1 in [Lo2] actually gave stronger conclusions under weaker assumptions: If the q-simplex η above is only a finite energy one (C^1-smooth simplex must be of finite energy), then the simplex η^k is finite energy homotopic to a finite energy q-simplex η_k. Hence Proposition 5.6 can be derived with the same reason as in [Lo2, Prop. 5.1] as long as we generalize an inequality as done in Lemma A.4 of Appendix. But we also give necessary details for the reader's convenience.

Proof of Proposition 5.6. Recall that for paths $\sigma : [a_1, a_2] \to M$ and $\delta : [b_1, b_2] \to M$ with $\sigma(a_2) = \delta(b_1)$ one often define new paths $\sigma^{-1} : [a_1, a_2] \to M$ by $\sigma^{-1}(t) := \sigma(a_2 + a_1 - t)$ and $\sigma * \delta : [a_1, a_2 + b_2 - b_1] \to M$ by $\sigma * \delta|_{[a_1,a_2]} = \sigma$ and

$$\sigma * \delta(t) := \delta(t - a_2 + b_1) \quad \text{for} \quad t \in [a_2, a_2 + b_2 - b_1].$$

Given a C^1-path $\rho : [a, b] \to H_\tau(\alpha^\tau)$ and an integer $k \geq 3$ we want to construct a path $\rho_k : [a, b] \to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ such that

$$\rho_k(a) = \psi^k(\rho(a)) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k(b) = \psi^k(\rho(b)).$$

Define the initial point curve β_ρ of ρ by

$$[a, b] \to M, \ s \mapsto \beta_\rho(s) = \rho(s)(0).$$

It is C^1-smooth. Following [Lo2, pp. 460] and [BK, pp. 381], for $0 \leq s \leq (b - a)/k$ and $1 \leq j \leq k - 2$ define
- $\tilde{\rho}_k(a + s) = \rho(a)^{k-1} * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right) * \rho(a + ks) * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right)^{-1}$,
- $\tilde{\rho}_k(a+j(b-a)/k+s) = \rho(a)^{k-j-1} * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right) * \rho(a+ks) * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right) * \rho(b)^j * (\beta_\rho)^{-1}$,
- $\tilde{\rho}_k(b - (b - a)/k + s) = \rho(a + ks) * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right) * \rho(b)^{k-1} * \left(\beta_\rho|_{[a,a+ks]}\right)^{-1}$.

These are piecewise C^1-smooth loops in M representing α^k, and

$$\tilde{\rho}(a) = \rho(a)^{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\rho}(b) = \rho(b) * \beta_\rho * \rho(b)^{k-1} * \beta_\rho^{-1}.$$

For each $u \in [a, b]$, reparametrising the loop $\tilde{\rho}_k(u)$ on $\mathbb{R}/k\tau$ as in [Lo2, pp.461] we get a piecewise C^1-smooth loop $\rho_k(u) \in H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ and therefore a piecewise C^1-smooth path $\rho_k : [a, b] \to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ with $\rho_k(a) = \psi^k(\rho(a)) = \rho(a)^k$ and $\rho_k(b) = \psi^k(\rho(b)) = \rho(b)^k$.

Replacing all the terms of powers of $\rho(a)$ and $\rho(b)$ by the constant point paths in the definition of $\tilde{\rho}_k$ above, we get a piecewise C^1-smooth path $\beta_{\rho,k} : [a, b] \to H_\tau(\alpha)$. For $s \in [a, b]$ and $j = [k(s - a)/(b - a)]$, by the arguments of [Lo2, pp. 461],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(\rho_k(s)) &= (k - j - 1)\mathcal{L}_\tau(\rho(a)) + j\mathcal{L}_\tau(\rho(b)) + \mathcal{L}_\tau(\beta_{\rho,k}(s)) \\ &\leq (k - 1)M_0(\rho) + M_1(\rho) + 2M_2(\rho), \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

where $M_0(\rho) = \max\{\mathcal{L}_\tau(\rho(a)), \mathcal{L}_\tau(\rho(b))\}$, $M_1(\rho) = \max_{a \leq s \leq b} |\mathcal{L}_\tau(\rho(s))|$ and

$$M_2(\rho) = \int_a^b \left|L(s, \beta_\rho(s), \dot{\beta}_\rho(s))\right| ds. \tag{5.18}$$

Note that (L_3) implies

$$|L(t, q, v)| \leq C(1 + \|v\|^2) \quad \forall (t, q, v) \in \mathbb{R} \times TM \tag{5.19}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore it follows from Lemma A.4 that

$$\begin{aligned} M_2(\rho) &= \int_a^b \left|L(s, \beta_\rho(s), \dot{\beta}_\rho(s))\right| ds \\ &\leq (b - a)C + C \int_a^b \left|\dot{\beta}_\rho(s)\right|^2 ds \leq (b - a)C + \frac{1 + \tau}{2\tau} Cc(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

This and (5.17) yield

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty}\sup\max_{a\le s\le b}\frac{1}{k}\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(\rho_k(s))\le M_0(\rho). \tag{5.20}$$

Next replacing [Lo2, Lem.2.3] by Lemma A.4, and almost repeating the reminder arguments of the proof of [Lo2, Prop.5.1], we can complete the proof of Proposition 5.6. □

Lemma 5.7 ([BK, Lem.1]) *Let (X, A) be a pair of topological spaces and β a singular relative p-cycle of (X, A). Let Σ denote the set of singular simplices of β together with all their faces. Suppose to every $\sigma\in\Sigma$, $\sigma:\Delta^q\to X$, $0\le q\le p$, there is assigned a map $P(\sigma):\Delta^q\times[0,1]\to X$ such that*

(i) *$P(\sigma)(z,0)=\sigma(z)$ for $z\in\Delta^q$,*

(ii) *$P(\sigma)(z,t)=\sigma(z)$ if $\sigma(\Delta^q)\subset A$,*

(iii) *$P(\sigma)(\Delta^q\times\{1\})\subset A$,*

(iv) *$P(\sigma)\circ(e^i_q\times id)=P(\sigma\circ e^i_q)$ for $0\le i\le q$.*

Then the homology class $[\beta]\in H_p(X,A)$ vanishes.

For the class ω in (5.15), by the definition of $\mathbf{I}_1$ above (5.12) we have

$$(\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega)\in H_n\big((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}([c-2\epsilon,c+2\epsilon]),(\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-2\epsilon);\mathbb{K}\big). \tag{5.21}$$

Since both $(\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}([c-2\epsilon,c+2\epsilon])$ and $(\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-2\epsilon)$ are at least C^2-smooth Hilbert manifolds, we can choose a C^1-smooth cycle representative σ of the class $(\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega)$. Denote by $\Sigma(\sigma)$ the set of all simplexes together with all their faces contained in σ. By [Ch, Ex.1, pp.33] each γ^k in (5.7) is a non-minimal saddle point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$. As in the proof of [Lo2, Prop. 5.2] we can use Proposition 5.6 and Lemma A.4 to get the corresponding result without using the finite energy homology.

Proposition 5.8 *There exists a sufficiently large integer $k(\sigma)\ge k_0$ such that for every integer $k\in Q(k(\sigma))$ and for every $\mu\in\Sigma(\sigma)$ with $\mu:\Delta_r\to H_\tau(\alpha^\tau)$ and $0\le r\le n$, there exists a homotopy $P(\psi^k(\mu)):\Delta_r\times[0,1]\to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau})$ such that the properties (i) to (iv) in Lemma 5.7 hold for $(X,A)=\big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^{k\tau}),(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^\circ_{k(c-\epsilon)}\big)$.*

It follows that the homology class $(\mathbf{J}_k)_*\circ(\psi^k)_*\circ(\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega)\in\mathcal{H}_k$ vanishes. By (5.15), $(j_{k\tau})_*\circ(\psi^k)_*(\omega)=0$ in $\mathcal{H}_k$. This contradicts to (5.14). Therefore Assumption $F(\alpha)$ can not hold. Theorem 1.1(i) is proved.

5.2. Proof of (ii). Since the inclusion $E_\tau\hookrightarrow C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z},M)$ is a homotopy equivalence, and therefore $\text{rank}H_r(E_\tau;\mathbb{K})\ne 0$ for all $\tau\in\mathbb{N}$. Consider the functional $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $E_{k\tau}$. It has still a nonempty critical point set. Replace Assumption $F(\alpha)$ by
Assumption F: (i) *For any given integer $k>0$, the system (1.6) only possesses finitely many distinct, k-periodic solutions*, (ii) *there exists an integer $k_0>1$ such that for each integer $k>k_0$, any k-periodic solution $\tilde\gamma$ of the system (1.6) must be an iteration of some l-periodic solution γ of the system (1.6) with $l\le k_0$ and $k=ls$ for some $s\in\mathbb{N}$.*

Then slightly modifying the proof of (i) above one can complete the proof. □

6 Proof of Theorem 1.4

The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.1. We only give the main points. Identifying $\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z} = [-\frac{\tau}{2}, \frac{\tau}{2}]/\{-\frac{\tau}{2}, \frac{\tau}{2}\}$, let

$$C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e := \{x \in C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M) \,|\, x(-t) = x(t) \ \ -\tau/2 \le t \le \tau/2\}.$$

We have a contraction from $C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e$ to the subset of constant loops in $C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e$ which is identified with M:

$$[0,1] \times C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e \to C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e, \ (s,x) \mapsto x_s,$$

where $x_s(t) = x(st)$ for $-\tau/2 \le t \le \tau/2$. Since the inclusion $C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e \hookrightarrow EH_\tau$ is also a homotopy equivalence, we get

$$H_n(EH_\tau; \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_n(C(\mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}, M)_e; \mathbb{Z}_2) = H_n(M; \mathbb{Z}_2) \ne 0 \tag{6.1}$$

for any $\tau > 0$. Note that $\mathcal{L}^E_\tau$ can always attain the minimal value on EH_τ and therefore has a nonempty critical set $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}^E_\tau)$. Under the conditions (L1)-(L4) we replace the Assumption F(α) in §5 by

Assumption FE: (i) *For any given integer $k > 0$, the system (1.6) possesses only finitely many distinct* `reversible` *$k\tau$-periodic solutions*, (ii) *there exists an integer $k_0 > 1$ such that for each integer $k > k_0$, any* `reversible` *$k\tau$-periodic solution $\tilde{\gamma}$ of the system (1.6) is an iteration of some reversible $l\tau$-periodic solution γ of the system (1.6) with $l \le k_0$ and $k = ls$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Under this assumption, as the arguments below Assumption F(α) we may get an integer $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ and finitely many reversible τ-periodic solutions of the system (1.6), $\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_p$, such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ every reversible $k\tau$-periodic solution of the system (1.6) has form γ_j^k for some $1 \le j \le p$. Namely,

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}) = \left\{ \gamma_j^k \ \middle| \ 1 \le j \le p \right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Using the same proof as one of Lemma 5.2 we may obtain:

Lemma 6.1 *Under Assumption FE, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a critical point γ_k' of $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ such that*

$$C_n(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}, \gamma_k'; \mathbb{Z}_2) \ne 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -n \le n - m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma_k') \le m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma_k') \le n. \tag{6.3}$$

Let $k_0 = 1$ if $\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j) = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le p$, and

$$k_0 = 1 + \max\left\{ \left[\frac{3n+2}{2\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j)}\right] \ \middle| \ \hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j) \ne 0,\ 1 \le j \le p \right\}$$

otherwise. Corresponding with Corollary 5.4 we have the following generalization of [LuW2, Lem.4.4].

Lemma 6.2 *Under Assumption FE, for any integer number $k \ge k_0$, every isolated critical point z of $\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}$ has the trivial $(n+1)$-th critical module, i.e.*

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}, z; \mathbb{K}) = 0.$$

Proof. Using the chart $\phi^E_{k\tau}$ in (3.29) let $\tilde{z} = (\phi^E_{k\tau})^{-1}(z)$. We only need to prove

$$C_{n+1}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{z}; \mathbb{K}) = 0 \quad \forall k \ge k_0. \tag{6.4}$$

Let $z = \gamma^k_j$ and thus $\tilde{z} = \tilde{\gamma}^k_j$ with $\tilde{\gamma}_j = (\phi^E_\tau)^{-1}(\gamma_j)$. By (4.41), it follows from Shifting theorem ([Ch, p.50, Th. 5.4]) and the Künneth formula that

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{n+1}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{z}; \mathbb{K}) &\cong C_{n+1}(\alpha^E_{k\tau} + \beta^E_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong C_{n+1-m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)}(\alpha^E_{k\tau}, 0; G) \otimes C_{m^-_{1,m\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)}(\beta^E_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \\
&\cong C_{n+1-m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)}(\alpha^E_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K}) \otimes \mathbb{K} \\
&\cong C_{n+1-m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)}(\alpha^E_{k\tau}, 0; \mathbb{K})
\end{aligned}$$

because 0 is a nondegenerate critical point of quadratic function $\beta^E_{k\tau}$. If (6.4) does not hold, we get that $0 \le n + 1 - m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \le m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)$ because $\tilde{\gamma}_{k\tau}$ is defined on a manifold of dimension $m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j) &= m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) = m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k_j), \\
m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\gamma}^k_j) &= m^0_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) = m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k_j).
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \le n + 1 \le m^-_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) + m^0_{1,k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \tag{6.5}$$

$$\texttt{or} \qquad m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k_j) \le n + 1 \le m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k_j) + m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k_j) \tag{6.6}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (2.24)

$$m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) - 2n \le m^-_{2,k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \le m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence it follows from this, (3.26) and (6.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}
2k\hat{m}^-_\tau(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_\tau, \tilde{\gamma}_j) - n &\le m^-_{2,k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) + m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \\
&\le 2m^-_{k\tau}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_{k\tau}, \tilde{\gamma}^k_j) \le 2n + 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when $\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j) = \hat{m}^-_\tau(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_\tau, \tilde{\gamma}_j) > 0$, $k \le \left[\frac{3n+2}{2\hat{m}_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j)}\right]$, which contradicts to $k \ge k_0$.

When $\hat{m}^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma_j) = \hat{m}^-_\tau(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^E_\tau, \tilde{\gamma}_j) = 0$, (3.22) and (6.6) also give a contradiction. The desired (6.4) is proved. □

Now as the arguments below Corollary 5.4, under Assumption FE we may use Lemma 6.1 to get an infinite subsequence Q of $\{2^m \,|\, m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$ and an $\gamma \in \{\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_p\}$ such that

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}
C_n(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}, \gamma^k; \mathbb{Z}_2) \ne 0, \\
m^-_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^-_{1,\tau}(\gamma), \quad m^0_{1,k\tau}(\gamma^k) = m^0_{1,\tau}(\gamma)
\end{array}\right\} \tag{6.7}$$

for any $k \in Q$. By Lemma 6.2, for any $x \in \{\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_p\}$ we have also

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}^E_{k\tau}, x^k; \mathbb{K}) = 0 \quad \forall k \in Q(k_0) := \{k \in Q \,|\, k \ge k_0\}. \tag{6.8}$$

Then from Proposition 5.5 to the end of §5.1 we only need to make suitable replacements for some notations such as $H_{j\tau}(\alpha^{j\tau})$, $\mathcal{L}_{j\tau}$ by $EH_{j\tau}$, $\mathcal{L}^E_{j\tau}$ for $j = 1, k$, and so on, and can complete the proof of Theorem 1.4.

7 Proof of Theorem 1.6

7.1. Proof of (i). Denote by $\mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \alpha^k)$ the set of critical orbits of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$. It is always nonempty because $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ can attain the minimal value on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$. Clearly, we may assume that each critical orbit of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ on $H_\tau(\alpha^k)$ is isolated for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. As in §5.1, by contradiction we assume:

Assumption $FT(\alpha)$: (i) *For any given integer $k > 0$, the system (1.6) only possesses finitely many distinct, $k\tau$-periodic solution orbit towers based on $k\tau$-periodic solutions of (1.6) representing α^k*, (ii) *there exists an integer $k_0 > 1$ such that for each integer $k > k_0$, any $k\tau$-periodic solution $\tilde{\gamma}$ of the system (1.6) representing α^k must be an iteration of some $l\tau$-periodic solution γ of the system (1.6) representing α^l with $l \le k_0$ and $k = lq$ for some $q \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Under this assumption, there only exist finitely many periodic solution orbit towers $\{s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_1^k\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}, \cdots, \{s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_p^k\}^{s\in\mathbb{R}}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the system (1.6) such that

- $\hat{\gamma}_i$ has period $k_i\tau \le k_0\tau$ and represents α^{k_i} for some $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, \cdots, p$;
- for each integer $k > k_0$ any $k\tau$-periodic solution γ of the system (1.6) representing α^k must be an iteration of some $s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_i$, i.e. $\gamma = (s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_i)^l = s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_i^l$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $lk_i = k$.

Set $m := k_0!$ (the factorial of k_0) and $\gamma_i = \hat{\gamma}_i^{m/k_i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, p$. Then each γ_i is a $m\tau$-periodic solution of the system (1.6) representing α^m. We conclude

Claim 7.1 *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{km\tau}, \alpha^{km}) = \left\{ S_{km\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k \;\middle|\; 1 \le j \le p \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}_{km\tau}, \alpha^{km})$. Since $km > k_0$, then $\gamma = (s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_i)^l$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ with $lk_i = km$. Hence $\gamma = s \cdot \hat{\gamma}_i^l = s \cdot (\hat{\gamma}_i)^{km/k_i} = s \cdot (\hat{\gamma}_i^{m/k_i})^k = s \cdot \gamma_i^k$. □

Hence replacing τ by $m\tau$ we may assume $m = 1$ below, i.e.

$$\mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k) = \left\{ S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k \;\middle|\; 1 \le j \le p \right\} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{7.1}$$

As in §5.1 we can also **assume**: $\gamma_j^* TM \to \mathbb{R}/\tau\mathbb{Z}$, $j = 1, \cdots, p$, are all trivial.

Lemma 7.2 *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\mathcal{O}_k \in \mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k)$ such that*

$$C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) \neq 0.$$

Moreover, $r - 2n \le r - 1 - m^0_{k\tau}(\mathcal{O}_k) \le m^-_{k\tau}(\mathcal{O}_k) \le r - 1$ if $\mathcal{O}_k$ is not a single point critical orbit, and $r - 2n \le r - m^0_{k\tau}(\mathcal{O}_k) \le m^-_{k\tau}(\mathcal{O}_k) \le r$ otherwise.

Proof. By Lemma 4.12 we only need to prove the first claim. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 5.2. Let $kc_1 < \cdots < kc_l$ be all critical values of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$, $l \le p$, and $\inf \mathcal{L}_{k\tau} = kc_1$, $k = 1, 2, \cdots$. As in the proof of Lemma 5.2 we have a large regular value b of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ such that $\mathrm{rank} H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_b; \mathbb{K}) > 0$. Take the regular values of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$, $a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_l = b$ such that $kc_i \in (a_{i-1}, a_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$. Noting (7.1), by Theorem 2.1 of [Wa] or the proof of Lemma 4 of [GM2, pp. 502], we get

$$H_r((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_i}, (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})_{a_{i-1}}; \mathbb{K}) \cong \bigoplus_{\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}(\gamma_j^k) = kc_i} C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K}).$$

Since each critical point has finite Morse index, (4.67) implies that each critical group $C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K})$ has finite rank. Almost repeating the proof of Lemma 5.2 we get some $S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k$ in $\mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k)$ such that $\mathrm{rank} C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K}) > 0$ and thus $\mathrm{rank} C_r(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0$. $\Box$

Corresponding to Corollary 5.4 we have

Lemma 7.3 *Under Assumption FT(α), for every integer $q \ge n + 1$ there exists a constant $k_0(q) > 0$ such that*

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) = 0$$

for every integer $k \ge k_0(q)$ and $\mathcal{O}_k \in \mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \alpha^k)$. Here $k_0(q) = 1$ if $\hat{m}_r^-(\gamma_j) = 0$ for all $1 \le j \le p$, and

$$k_0(q) = 1 + \max\left\{ \left[\frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_r^-(\gamma_j)} \right] \,\Big|\, \hat{m}_r^-(\gamma_j) \ne 0,\ 1 \le j \le p \right\}$$

otherwise.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_k = S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k$. If γ_j is constant, by the proof of Lemma 5.3 we have

$$C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) = C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \gamma_j^k; \mathbb{K}) = 0$$

for any $k > k(q, \gamma_j)$, where $k(q, \gamma_j) = 1$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) = 0$, and $k(q, \gamma_j) = \frac{q+n}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j)}$ if $\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) \ne 0$.

Suppose that γ_j is not a constant solution. If $C_q(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \mathcal{O}_k; \mathbb{K}) \ne 0$, Lemma 4.12 yields

$$m_{k\tau}^-(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k) \le q - 1 \le m_{k\tau}^-(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k) + m_{k\tau}^0(S_{k\tau} \cdot \gamma_j^k). \tag{7.2}$$

By (4.53) this becomes

$$m_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \le q - 1 \le m_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) + m_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) - 1. \tag{7.3}$$

If $\hat{m}_\tau(\gamma_j) > 0$, it follows from (7.3) and (3.2) that

$$k\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j) - n \le m_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \le q - 1$$

and therefore $k \le \frac{q+n-1}{\hat{m}_\tau^-(\gamma_j)}$. This contradicts to $k \ge k_0(q)$. If $\hat{m}_\tau(\gamma_j) = 0$, by (3.2),

$$0 \le m_{k\tau}^-(\gamma_j^k) \le n - m_{k\tau}^0(\gamma_j^k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It follows that

$$m^-_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k_j)+m^0_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k_j)=m^-_{k\tau}(\gamma^k_j)+m^0_{k\tau}(\gamma^k_j)-1\le n-1.$$

Since $q\ge n+1$, (7.2) implies that $m^-_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k_j)+m^0_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k_j)\ge n$. This also gives a contradiction. Lemma 7.3 is proved. □

Clearly, Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3 imply Theorem 1.1(i) in the case $r\ge n+1$.

`In the following we consider the case` $r=n$.

Under Assumption $FT(\alpha)$ we apply Lemma 7.2 to all $k\in\{2^m\,|\,m\in\{0\}\cup\mathbb{N}\}$ to get an infinite subsequence Q of $\{2^m\,|\,m\in\{0\}\cup\mathbb{N}\}$, some $l\in\mathbb{N}$ and an $\gamma\in\{\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_p\}$ such that $C_n(\mathcal{L}_{kl\tau},S_{kl\tau}\cdot\gamma^{kl};\mathbb{K})\ne 0$, $m^-_{kl\tau}(S_{kl\tau}\cdot\gamma^{kl})=m^-_{l\tau}(S_{l\tau}\cdot\gamma^l)$ and $m^0_{kl\tau}(S_{kl\tau}\cdot\gamma^{kl})=m^0_{l\tau}(S_{l\tau}\cdot\gamma^l)$ for any $k\in Q$. As before we **always assume** $l=1$ in the following. Then we have

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} C_n(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k;\mathbb{K})\ne 0\quad\text{and}\\ m^-_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k)=m^-_\tau(S_\tau\cdot\gamma),\quad m^0_{k\tau}(S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k)=m^0_\tau(S_\tau\cdot\gamma)\end{array}\right\}\tag{7.4}$$

for any $k\in Q$. By Lemma 7.3 there exists $k_0>0$ such that for any $\gamma\in\{\gamma_1,\cdots,\gamma_p\}$,

$$C_{n+1}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},S_{k\tau}\cdot\gamma^k;\mathbb{K})=0\quad\forall k\in Q(k_0):=\{k\in Q\,|\,k\ge k_0\}.\tag{7.5}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{O}=S_\tau\cdot\gamma$, and by $c=\mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)=\mathcal{L}_\tau(\mathcal{O})$. Under Assumption FT($\alpha$), as in §5.1 let us take $\nu>0$ sufficiently small so that for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$ the interval $[k(c-3\nu),k(c+3\nu)]$ contains an unique critical value kc of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}\big(\mathcal{KO}(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\alpha^k)\big)\cap[k(c-3\nu),k(c+3\nu)]=\{kc\}.$$

For any $k\in Q$, by Theorem 4.11, we may choose a topological Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{L}_\tau$ at $\mathcal{O}\subset H_\tau(\alpha)$, $(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}),\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)$ satisfying

$$\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}),\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-\big)\subset\big((\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}([c-2\nu,c+2\nu]),(\mathcal{L}_\tau)^{-1}(c-2\nu)\big)\,,\tag{7.6}$$

and a topological Gromoll-Meyer pair of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ at $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})\subset H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$,

$$\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big)$$

such that

$$\big(\psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})),\psi^k(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-)\big)\subset\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big)\quad\text{and}\tag{7.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big)\subset\\ &\qquad\big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}([kc-2k\nu,kc+2k\nu]),(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc-2k\nu)\big)\end{aligned}\tag{7.8}$$

and that the iteration map $\psi^k:H_\tau(\alpha)\to H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ induces an isomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^k_*:C_*(\mathcal{L}_\tau,\mathcal{O};\mathbb{K})&:=H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}),\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-;\mathbb{K}\big)\\ &\longrightarrow C_*(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau},\psi^k(\mathcal{O});\mathbb{K}):=H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})),\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-;\mathbb{K}\big).\end{aligned}$$

Identifying $\psi(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$, for $j = 1, k$, denote by the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{h}_1^j &: \big(\widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-\big) \hookrightarrow \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c-2\nu)}\big),\\
\mathbf{h}_2^j &: \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c-2\nu)}\big) \hookrightarrow \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}\big),\\
\mathbf{h}_3^j &: \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}\big) \hookrightarrow \big(H_{j\tau}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

As in §5.1 we have monomorphisms on homology modules,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{h}_2^j \circ \mathbf{h}_1^j)_* &: H_*\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-; \mathbb{K}\big) \to H_*\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}; \mathbb{K}\big),\\
(\mathbf{h}_3^j)_* &: H_*\big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})_{j(c+2\nu)}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}; \mathbb{K}\big) \to H_*\big(H_{j\tau}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{j(c-\nu)}; \mathbb{K}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_j &: \big(\widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^j(\mathcal{O}))^-\big) \hookrightarrow \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}([jc - 2j\nu, jc + 2j\nu]), (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}(jc - 2j\nu)\big),\\
\mathbf{J}_j &: \big((\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}([jc - 2j\nu, jc + 2j\nu]), (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^{-1}(jc - 2j\nu)\big) \hookrightarrow \big(H_{j\tau}, (\mathcal{L}_{j\tau})^\circ_{jc-j\nu}\big)
\end{aligned}$$

satisfy

$$\mathbf{J}_j \circ \mathbf{I}_j = \mathbf{h}_3^j \circ \mathbf{h}_2^j \circ \mathbf{h}_1^j, \quad j = 1, k. \tag{7.9}$$

By (7.7), we have also

$$\psi^k \circ \mathbf{I}_1 = \mathbf{I}_k \circ \psi^k \tag{7.10}$$

as maps from $\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-\big)$ to $\big((\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}([kc - 2k\nu, kc + 2k\nu]), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^{-1}(kc - 2k\nu)\big)$. These yield the following corresponding result with Proposition 5.5.

Proposition 7.4 *Under Assumption FT(α), there exist a τ-periodic solution γ of (1.6) representing α, a large integer $k_0 > 0$, an infinite integer set Q containing* 1, *and a small $\epsilon > 0$ having properties: For the orbit $\mathcal{O} = S_\tau \cdot \gamma$ and any $k \in Q(k_0) := \{k \in Q \mid k \geq k_0\}$ there exist topological Gromoll-Meyer pairs $\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-\big)$ and $\big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big)$ satisfying (7.6)-(7.8) such that for the inclusion*

$$j_{k\tau} = \mathbf{h}_3^k \circ \mathbf{h}_2^k \circ \mathbf{h}_1^k : \big(\widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O})), \widehat{W}(\psi^k(\mathcal{O}))^-\big) \to \big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^\circ_{k(c-\nu)}\big)$$

the following diagram holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \neq C_n(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) &\xrightarrow{\psi_*^k} C_n(\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}, \psi^k(\mathcal{O}); \mathbb{K})\\
&\xrightarrow{(j_{k\tau})_*} H_n\big(H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k), (\mathcal{L}_{k\tau})^\circ_{k(c-\nu)}; \mathbb{K}\big) \equiv \mathcal{H}_k,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

where $c = \mathcal{L}_\tau(\gamma)$, ψ_*^k is an isomorphism, and $(j_{k\tau})_*$ is a monomorphism among the singular homology modules. In particular, if ω is a generator of $C_n(\mathcal{L}_\tau, \mathcal{O}; \mathbb{K}) = H_n\big(\widehat{W}(\mathcal{O}), \widehat{W}(\mathcal{O})^-; \mathbb{K}\big)$, then

$$(j_{k\tau})_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega) \neq 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_k, \tag{7.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(j_{k\tau})_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega) &= (\mathbf{J}_k)_* \circ (\mathbf{I}_k)_* \circ (\psi^k)_*(\omega)\\
&= (\mathbf{J}_k)_* \circ (\psi^k)_* \circ (\mathbf{I}_1)_*(\omega) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{H}_k.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.13}$$

Now we can slightly modify the arguments from Proposition 5.6 to Proposition 5.8 to complete the proof of (i). The only place which should be noted is that for $\psi^k(\mathcal{O})$ in (7.11) Lemma 4.13 implies each point $y \in \psi^k(\mathcal{O})$ to be a non-minimum saddle point of $\mathcal{L}_{k\tau}$ on $H_{k\tau}(\alpha^k)$ in the case $\dim M = n > 1$.

7.2. Proof of (ii) can be completed by the similar arguments as in §5.2.

8 Questions and remarks

For a C^3-smooth compact n-dimensional manifold M without boundary, and a C^2-smooth map $H : \mathbb{R}\times T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the conditions (H1)-(H5), we have shown in 1°) of Theorem 1.12 that the Poincaré map Ψ^H has infinitely many distinct periodic points sitting in the zero section 0_{T^*M} of T^*M. Notice that the condition (H5) can be expressed as: $H(t,x) = H(-t,\tau_0(x))\ \forall (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times M$, where $\tau_0 : T^*M \to T^*M,\ (q,p)\mapsto (q,-p)$, is the standard anti-symplectic involution. So it is natural to consider the following question: Let (P,ω,τ) be a **real symplectic manifold** with an anti-symplectic involution τ on (P,ω), i.e. $\tau^*\omega = -\omega$ and $\tau^2 = id_P$. A smooth time dependent Hamiltonian function $H : \mathbb{R}\times P\to\mathbb{R}, (t,x)\mapsto H(t,x) = H_t(x)$ is said to be **1-periodic in time and symmetric** if it satisfies

$$H_t(x) = H_{t+1}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad H(t,x) = H(-t,\tau(x))\ \forall (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times P.$$

In this case, the Hamiltonian vector fields X_{H_t} satisfies $X_{H_{t+1}}(x) = X_{H_t}(x) = -d\tau(\tau(x))X_{H_{-t}}(\tau(x))$ for all $(t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times P$. If the global flow of

$$\dot{x}(t) = X_{H_t}(x(t)) \tag{8.1}$$

exists, denoted by Ψ^H_t, then it is obvious that

$$\Psi^H_{t+1} = \Psi^H_t\circ\Psi^H_1\ \forall t\in\mathbb{R}, \quad \Psi^H_1\circ\tau = \tau\circ(\Psi^H_1)^{-1}.$$

So each τ-invariant k-periodic point x_0, i.e. $\tau(x_0) = x_0$, of $\Psi^H = \Psi^H_1$ with $k\in\mathbb{N}$ yields a k-periodic contractible solution $x(t) = \Psi^H_t(x_0)$ of (8.1) satisfying $x(-t) = \tau(x(t))$ for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$. Such a solution is called τ-**reversible**. By [Vi1, p.4] the fixed point set $L := \mathrm{Fix}(\tau)$ of τ is either empty or a Lagrange submanifold. It is natural to ask the following more general version of the Conley conjecture.

Question 8.1 Suppose that L is nonempty and compact, and that (P,ω) satisfies some good condition (e.x. geometrically bounded for some $J\in\mathbb{R}\mathcal{J}(P,\omega) := \{J\in\mathcal{J}(P,\omega)\,|\,J\circ d\tau = -d\tau\circ J\}$ and Riemannian metric μ on P). Has the system (8.1) infinitely many distinct τ-reversible contractible periodic solutions of integer periods? Furthermore, if the flow Ψ^H_t exists globally, has the Poincaré map $\Psi^H = \Psi^H_1$ infinitely many distinct periodic points sitting in L?

Let $\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)$ denote the set of all contractible τ-reversible 1-periodic solutions of (8.1). Since the Conley conjecture came from the Arnold conjecture, Question 8.1 naturally suggests the following more general versions of the Arnold conjectures.

Question 8.2 Under the assumptions of Question 8.1, $\sharp\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)\geq \mathrm{Cuplength}_{\mathbb{F}}(L)$ for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z},\mathbb{Z}_2$? Moreover, if some nondegenerate assumptions for elements of $\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)$ are satisfied, $\sharp\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)\geq\sum_{k=0}^{\dim L} b_k(L,\mathbb{F})$?

This question is closely related to the Arnold-Givental conjecture, cf. [Lu1]. In order to study it we try to construct a real Floer homology $FH_*(P,\omega,\tau,H)$ with $\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)$ under some nondegenerate assumptions for elements of $\mathcal{P}_0(H,\tau)$, which is expected to be isomorphic to $H_*(M)$. Moreover, if $L\in C^2(\mathbb{R}/Z\times TM)$ satisfies (L1)-(L4) and the functional $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)=\int_0^1 L(t,\gamma(t),\dot\gamma(t))dt$ on EH_1 has only nondegenerate critical points, then one can, as in [AbSc, §2.2], construct a Morse complex $CM_*(\mathcal{L})$ whose homology is isomorphic to $H_*(M)$ as well. As in [Vi3, SaWe, AbSc], it is also natural to construct an isomorphism between $HF_*(T^*M,\omega_{\rm can},\tau_0,H)$ and $H(CM_*(\mathcal{L}))$ and to study different product operations in them.

The author believes that the techniques developed in this paper are useful for one to generalize the results of multiple periodic solutions of some Lagrangian and Hamiltonian systems on the Euclidean space to manifolds.

9 Appendix

A.1. Proof of Proposition A. The first claim is a direct consequence of the following (9.4). As to the second, since for each $t\in\mathbb{R}$ the functions $L_t=L(t,\cdot)$ and $H_t=H(t,\cdot)$ are Fenchel transformations of each other, we only need to prove that (H2)-(H3) can be satisfied under the assumptions (L2)-(L3). For conveniences we omit the time variable t. In any local coordinates $(q_1,\cdots,q_n)$, we write $(q,v)=(q_1,\cdots,q_n,v_1,\cdots,v_n)$. By definition of H we have

$$H\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)=-L(q,v)+\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial L}{\partial v_j}(q,v)v_j.\tag{9.1}$$

Differentiating both sides with respect to the variable v_i we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i\partial v_j}(q,v)=\sum_{j=1}^n v_j\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i\partial v_j}(q,v).$$

Since the matrix $\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i\partial v_j}(q,v)\Big]$ is invertible, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)=v_j.\tag{9.2}$$

Let $p=\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)$. Differentiating both sides of (9.1) with respect to the variable q_i and using (9.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j=1}^n v_j\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i\partial v_j}(q,v)-\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}(q,v)\\ =\;&\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)+\sum_{j=1}^n\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i\partial v_j}(q,v)\\ =\;&\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}\big(q,\frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)+\sum_{j=1}^n v_j\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i\partial v_j}(q,v)\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big) = -\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_i}(q,v). \tag{9.3}$$

Differentiating both sides of (9.2) with respect to the variable v_i yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_j \partial p_k}(q,p)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_k \partial v_i}(q,v) = \delta_{ij},\ \textit{i.e.} \\
&\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(q,p)\Big] = \Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j}(q,v)\Big]^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.4}$$

Differentiating both sides of (9.2) with respect to the variable q_i, and both sides of (9.3) with respect to the variable q_j respectively, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_j \partial q_i}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_j \partial p_k}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_k \partial q_i}(q,v) = 0, \\
&\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_k}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_k \partial q_j}(q,v) = -\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(q,v),
\end{aligned}$$

or their equivalent expressions of matrixes,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big] + \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial q_j}(q,v)\Big] = 0, \\
&\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big] + \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]^t\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial q_j}(q,v)\Big] = -\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(q,v)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from these that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(q,v)\Big] \\
&= \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]^t \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]^{-1} \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big] \\
&-\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{9.5}$$

Finally, differentiating both sides of (9.3) with respect to the variable v_j we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial v_j}(q,v) &= -\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_k}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_k \partial v_j}(q,v),\ \textit{i.e.} \\
\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial v_j}(q,v)\Big] &= -\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]\Big[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j}(q,v)\Big] \\
&= -\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}\big(q, \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)\big)\Big]^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.6}$$

Here the final equality is due to (9.4). Since $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial v}(q,v)$ and $v = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(q,p)$, the desired conclusions will follow from (9.4)-(9.6). Indeed, by (9.4) it is easily seen that (L2) is equivalent to

(H2') $\sum_{ij} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p) u_i u_j \le \frac{1}{c}|\mathbf{u}|^2 \quad \forall \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Moreover, the three inequalities in (L3) have respectively the following equivalent versions in terms of matrix norms:

$$\left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,v)\right]\right| \le C(1+|v|^2), \quad \left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q_i \partial v_j}(t,q,v)\right]\right| \le C(1+|v|)$$
$$\text{and} \qquad \left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial v_i \partial v_j}(t,q,v)\right]\right| \le C.$$

Then (L3) is equivalent to the following

(H3') $\left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right]^t \left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right]^{-1} \left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right] - \left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right]\right|$
$\le C\Big(1 + \left|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\right|^2\Big)$,
$\left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right] \left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right]^{-1}\right| \le C\Big(1 + \left|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\right|\Big)$, and

$\left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right]^{-1}\right| \le C$.

Here $\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p) = \Big(\frac{\partial H}{\partial p_1}(t,q,p), \cdots, \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_n}(t,q,p)\Big)$, and $|A|$ denotes the standard norm of matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, i.e. $|A| = (\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$ if $A = (a_{ij})$.

Note that $|A| = \sup_{|x|=1} |(Ax,x)_{\mathbb{R}^n}|$ for any symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, and $|A| = \sup_{|x|=1}(Ax,x)_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ if A is also positive definite, where $(\cdot,\cdot)_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is the standard inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. As usual, for two symmetric positive matrixes $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, by "$A \le B$" we mean that $(Ax,x)_{\mathbb{R}^n} \le (Bx,x)_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then it is easily proved that

$$\left|\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\Big]^{-1}\right| \le C \Longleftrightarrow \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\Big] \ge \frac{1}{C} I_n. \tag{9.7}$$

This and (H2') yield

$$\frac{1}{C} I_n \le \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\Big] \le \frac{1}{c} I_n.$$

Lemma A.1. *For a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and symmetric matrixes $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, suppose that there exist constants $0 < c < C$ and $\alpha \ge 0$ such that*
(i) $\frac{1}{C} I_n \le A \le \frac{1}{c} I_n$,
(ii) $|BA^{-1}| \le C(1+\alpha)$,
(iii) $|B^t A^{-1} B - E| \le C(1+\alpha^2)$.
Then it holds that

$$|B| \le \frac{C}{c}(1+\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad |E| \le \Big(\frac{2C^3}{c^2} + C\Big)(1+\alpha^2). \tag{9.8}$$

Conversely, if (i) and (9.8) are satisfied, then

$$|BA^{-1}| \le \frac{C^2}{c}(1+\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad |B^t A^{-1} B - E| \le \Big(\frac{4C^3}{c^2} + C\Big)(1+\alpha^2). \tag{9.9}$$

Proof. By (i), $|A| \le \frac{1}{c}$ and $|A^{-1}| \le C$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&|B| = |BA^{-1}A| \le |BA^{-1}||A| \le \frac{C}{c}(1+\alpha),\\
&|E| = |B^tA^{-1}B - E - B^tA^{-1}B| \le |B^tA^{-1}B - E| + |B^tA^{-1}B|\\
&\quad \le C(1+\alpha^2) + |B|^2|A^{-1}| \le C(1+\alpha^2) + \frac{C^3}{c^2}(1+\alpha)^2\\
&\quad \le C(1+\alpha^2) + \frac{2C^3}{c^2}(1+\alpha^2)\\
&\quad \le (C + \frac{2C^3}{c^2})(1+\alpha^2).
\end{aligned}$$

(9.8) is proved. The "conversely" part is easily proved as well. □

By this lemma we get immediately:

Proposition A.2. *In any local coordinates* $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$*, the conditions (L2)-(L3) are equivalent to the fact that there exist constants* $0 < C_1 < C_2$*, depending on the local coordinates, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_1 I_n \le \Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\Big] \le C_2 I_n,\\
&\Big|\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\Big]\Big| \le C_2\Big(1 + \Big|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\Big|\Big),\\
&\Big|\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\Big]\Big| \le C_2\Big(1 + \Big|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\Big|^2\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

For each $(t,q) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times M$, since the function $T_q^*M \to \mathbb{R}$, $p \mapsto H(t,q,p)$ is strictly convex, it has a unique minimal point $\bar{p} = \bar{p}(t,q)$. In particular, $D_pH(t,q,\bar{p}) = 0$. Recall that the diffeomorphism $\mathfrak{L}_H$ in (1.3) is the inverse of $\mathfrak{L}_L$ in (1.5), and that $L(t,q,v) = \langle p(t,q,v), v\rangle - H(t,q,p(t,q,v))$, where $p = p(t,q,v)$ is a unique point determined by the equality $v = D_pH(t,q,p)$. It follows that

$$\{(t,q,\bar{p}(t,q)) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times T^*M \,|\, (t,q) \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times M\} = \mathfrak{L}_H(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times 0_{TM})$$

is a compact subset. So in any local coordinates $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, there exists a constant $C_3 > 0$, depending on the local coordinates, such that the expression of $\bar{p} = \bar{p}(t,q)$ in the local coordinate $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, denoted by $\bar{p} = (\bar{p}_1, \cdots, \bar{p}_n)$, satisfies

$$|\bar{p}| = |(\bar{p}_1, \cdots, \bar{p}_n)| \le C_3. \tag{9.10}$$

By the mean value theorem we have $0 < \theta = \theta(t,q,p) < 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\Big| &= \Big|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p) - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,\bar{p})\Big|\\
&= \Big|\Big[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}\big(t,q,\theta p + (1-\theta)\bar{p}\big)\Big](p-\bar{p})^t\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the first inequality in Proposition A.2 implies

$$C_1|\mathbf{u}| \le \left|\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\mathbf{u}\right| \le C_2|\mathbf{u}| \quad \forall \mathbf{u} = (u_1, \cdots, u_n)^t \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

using (9.10) and the inequality $ab \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}a^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}b^2$ $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ we easily get

$$C_1|p| - C_1C_3 \le C_1|p-\bar{p}| \le \left|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\right| \le C_2|p-\bar{p}| \le C_2|p| + C_2C_3,$$

$$\frac{C_1^2}{2}|p|^2 - 2C_1^2C_3^2 \le \left|\frac{\partial H}{\partial p}(t,q,p)\right|^2 \le 2C_2^2|p|^2 + 2C_2^2C_3^3.$$

These two inequalities and Proposition A.2 lead to: In any local coordinates $(q_1, \cdots, q_n)$, the conditions (L2)-(L3) are equivalent to the fact that there exist constants $0 < c < C$, depending on the local coordinates, such that

$$cI_n \le \left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right] \le CI_n \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial p_j}(t,q,p)\right]\right| \le C(1+|p|), \qquad \left|\left[\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial q_i \partial q_j}(t,q,p)\right]\right| \le C(1+|p|^2).$$

Proposition A is proved. □

A.2. An inequality for C^1-simplex in C^1 Riemannian-Hilbert manifolds. For every integer $q \ge 0$ we denote by $\triangle_q$ the standard closed q-dimensional simplex in $\mathbb{R}^q$ with vertices $e_0 = 0, e_1, \cdots, e_q$, i.e. $\triangle_0 = \{0\}$ and

$$\triangle_q := \{(t_1, \cdots, t_q) \in \mathbb{R}^n_{\ge 0} \,|\, t_1 + \cdots + t_q \le 1\}$$

with $q \ge 1$. For $1 \le i \le q$ denote by $F^i_q : \triangle_{q-1} \to \triangle_q$ the i-th face. Let $e(s) = (s, \cdots, s) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $s \in [0,1]$, $\hat{e} = e(1/(q+1))$, and L be the straight line passing through $e(0)$ and $\hat{e}$ successively in $\mathbb{R}^q$, i.e. $L = \{s\hat{e} \,|\, s \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then we have an orthogonal subspace decomposition

$$\mathbb{R}^q = V_{q-1} \times L,$$

and each $w \in \triangle_q$ may be uniquely written as $w = (v, s_0) \in [V_{q-1} \times L] \cap \triangle_q$. Denote by $l(v)$ the intersection segment of $\triangle_q$ with the straight line passing through w and parallel to L, i.e. $l(v) = \{w + s\hat{e} \in \triangle_q \,|\, s \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{(v,s) \,|\, s_1 \le s \le s_2\}$ for some $s_1 \le s_0$ and $s_2 \ge s_0$. Clearly, each $l(v)$ has length no more than $\sqrt{q}/2$.

Let $(\mathcal{M}, \langle,\rangle)$ be a C^1 Riemannian-Hilbert manifold and $\|\cdot\|$ be the induced Finsler metric. For $\phi \in C(\triangle_q, \mathcal{M})$ and each $w = (v, s_0) \in [V_{q-1} \times L] \cap \triangle_q$ we define

$$\widetilde{\phi}_v : l(v) \to \mathcal{M}, s \mapsto \phi(v,s).$$

If $\phi \in C^1(\triangle_q, \mathcal{M})$, i.e. ϕ can be extended into a C^1-map from some open neighborhood of $\triangle_q$ in $\mathbb{R}^q$ to $\mathcal{M}$, then there exists a constant $c = c(\phi) > 0$ such that

$$\left\|\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\phi(v,s)\right\|^2 \le c(\phi), \quad \forall (v,s) \in \triangle_q.$$

So for any $(v, s) \in \triangle_q$ we get

$$\int_{l(v)} \left\| \frac{d}{ds} \tilde{\phi}_v(s) \right\|^2 ds \le c(\phi) \text{Length}(l(v)) \le \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2} c(\phi). \tag{9.11}$$

Now consider the case $\mathcal{M} = E_\tau = W^{1,2}(S_\tau, M)$ with the Riemannian metric given by (1.13). Using the local coordinate chart in (3.8) it is easy to prove

Lemma A.3. *For each $t \in S_\tau$ the evaluation map*

$$\mathbf{EV}_t : W^{1,2}(S_\tau, M) \to M, \ \gamma \mapsto \gamma(t)$$

is continuous and maps $W^{1,2}$-curves in E_τ to $W^{1,2}$-curves in M.

Proof. We only need to prove the case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $[a, b] \to \gamma(s)$ be a $W^{1,2}$-curve in $W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then $\xi(s) := \frac{d}{ds}\gamma(s)$ is a $W^{1,2}$-vector field along $\gamma(s)$. Since $T_{\gamma(s)} W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n) = W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$, $\xi(s) \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon) - \gamma(s)}{\epsilon} - \xi(s) \right\|_{W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)} = 0.$$

Carefully checking the proof of Proposition 1.2.1(ii) in [Kl, pp. 9] one easily derives

$$\|\eta\|_{C^0} \le \sqrt{\frac{1+\tau}{\tau}} \|\eta\|_{W^{1,2}} \quad \forall \eta \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n). \tag{9.12}$$

Hence we get

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon)(t) - \gamma(s)(t)}{\epsilon} - \xi(s)(t) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} = 0$$

uniformly in t. This means that $[a, b] \to M$, $s \to \mathbf{EV}_t(\gamma(s))$, is differentiable and

$$\frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{EV}_t(\gamma(s)) = \xi(s)(t) \quad \text{at each} \quad s \in [a, b]. \tag{9.13}$$

Fix a $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon) - \gamma(s)}{\epsilon} - \xi(s) \right\|_{W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)} \le \sqrt{\frac{1+\tau}{\tau}}.$$

By (9.12) we get

$$\left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon)(t) - \gamma(s)(t)}{\epsilon} - \xi(s)(t) \right\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} \le 1 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows that for any $s \in [a, b]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi(s)(t)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} &\le 2\left[\left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon)(t) - \gamma(s)(t)}{\epsilon} - \xi(s)(t) \right\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \left\| \frac{\gamma(s+\epsilon)(t) - \gamma(s)(t)}{\epsilon} \right\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} \right] \\
&\le 2\left[1 + \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \|\gamma(s+\epsilon)(t) - \gamma(s)(t)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} \right] \\
&\le 2\left[1 + \frac{1+\tau}{\tau\epsilon^2} \|\gamma(s+\epsilon) - \gamma(s)\|^2_{W^{1,2}(S_\tau, \mathbb{R}^n)} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Here the final inequality is due to (9.12). Hence $\int_a^b \|\xi(s)(t)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n}\, ds < +\infty$, and thus $\int_a^b \left\|\frac{d}{ds}\mathbf{EV}_t(\gamma(s))\right\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^n} ds < +\infty$ because of (9.13). □

For a singular simplex σ from $\triangle_q$ to E_τ and every $w = (v, s_0) \in \triangle_q$, define curves

$$\widetilde{\sigma}^t_v : l(v) \to M,\ s \mapsto \mathbf{EV}_t(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)) = \widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t) \tag{9.14}$$

for each $t \in S_\tau$. The curve $\widetilde{\sigma}^0_v$ is called the **initial point curve**. Suppose that $\sigma \in C^1(\triangle_q, E_\tau)$. Then $\tilde{\sigma}_v \in C^1(l(v), E_\tau)$, and by (9.11) there exists a positive constant $c(\sigma)$ such that

$$\int_{l(v)} \left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right\|^2_{W^{1,2}(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)} ds \le \frac{\sqrt{q}}{2} c(\sigma) \tag{9.15}$$

for any $(v, s) \in \triangle_q$, where $\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s) \in T_{\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)}E_\tau = W^{1,2}(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)$. Specially, by Lemma A.3 we get each $\widetilde{\sigma}^t_v \in W^{1,2}(l(v), M)$ for any t. As in the proof of Proposition 1.2.1(ii) in [Kl, pp. 9] one can easily derive that

$$\|\xi\|_{C^0(\gamma^*TM)} \le \sqrt{\frac{1+\tau}{\tau}} \|\xi\|_{W^{1,2}(\gamma^*TM)}$$

for any $\gamma \in W^{1,2}(S_\tau, M)$ and $\xi \in W^{1,2}(\gamma^*TM)$. Applying to $\gamma = \widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)$ and $\xi = \frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)$ we get

$$\left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right\|^2_{C^0(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)} \le \frac{1+\tau}{\tau} \left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right\|^2_{W^{1,2}(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)}. \tag{9.16}$$

Moreover, it follows from (9.13) and (9.14) that

$$\left(\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right)(t) = \frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}^t_v(s) = \frac{d}{ds}(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t)) \in T_{\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t)}M$$

for all $s \in [a, b]$ and $t \in S_\tau$. Hence for any $t \in S_\tau$, we can derive from (9.16) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}^t_v(s)\right\|^2_{T_{\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t)}M} &= \left\|\left(\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right)(t)\right\|^2_{T_{\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t)}M} \\
&\le \left(\max_{t\in S_\tau}\left\|\left(\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right)(t)\right\|_{T_{\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)(t)}M}\right)^2 \\
&= \left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right\|^2_{C^0(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)} \\
&\le \frac{1+\tau}{\tau}\left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)\right\|^2_{W^{1,2}(\widetilde{\sigma}_v(s)^*TM)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This and (9.15) together give the following generalization of [Lo2, Lem. 2.3].

Lemma A.4. *If $\sigma \in C^1(\triangle_q, E_\tau)$, for every $w = (v, s_0) \in \triangle_q$, it holds that*

$$\int_{l(v)} \left\|\frac{d}{ds}\widetilde{\sigma}^0_v(s)\right\|^2_{T_{\widetilde{\sigma}^0_v(s)}M} ds \le \frac{(1+\tau)\sqrt{q}}{2\tau} c(\sigma).$$

References

[AbF] A. Abbondandolo, A. Figalli, High action orbits for Tonelli Lagrangians and superlinear Hamiltonians on compact configuration spaces. *J. Differential Equations*, **234**(2007), no. 2, 626–653.

[AbSc] A. Abbondandolo, M. Schwarz, On the Floer homology of cotangent bundles. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, **59**(2006), 254-316.

[BK] V. Bangert, W. Klingenberg, Homology generated by iterated closed geodesics. *Topology.* 22. (1983). 379-388.

[Be] V. Benci, Periodic solutions of Lagrangian systems on a compact manifold. *J. Differential Equations*, **63**(1986), no. 2, 135–161.

[CLM] S.E. Cappell, R. Lee, E.Y. Miller, On the Maslov-type index. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **47**(1994), 121-186.

[CaTa] J. Campos, M. Tarallo, Large minimal period orbits of periodic autonomous system. *Nonlinearity*, **17**(2004), 357-370.

[Ch] K. C. Chang, *Infinite Dimensional Morse Theory and Multiple Solution Problem.* Birkhäuser, 1993.

[Ci] K. Cieliebak, Pseudo-holomorphic curves and periodic orbits on cotangent bundles. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, **73** (1994), 251-278.

[Co] C. C. Conley, Lecture at the University of Wisconsin, April 6, 1984.

[CoZe] C. C. Conley, E. Zehnder, Morse-type index theory for flows and periodic solutions for Hamiltonian equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **37**(1984), 207–253.

[DDP] M.A. De Gosson, S. M. De Gosson and P. Piccione, On a product formula for the ConleyCZehnder index of symplectic paths and its applications. *Ann. Global Anal. Geom.*, DOI 10.1007/s10455-008-9106-z, Published online: 14 March 2008.

[Fa] A. Fathi, *Weak Kam Theorem in Lagrangian Dynamics*, Pisa, Version 16 February, 2005.

[FrHa] J. Franks, M. Handel, Periodic points of Hamiltonian surface diffeomorphism, *Geom. Topol.*, **7**(2003), 713-756.

[GM1] D. Gromoll, W. Meyer, On differentiable functions with isolated critical points, *Topology*, **8** (1969), 361–369.

[GM2] D. Gromoll and W. Meyer, Periodic geodesics on compact Riemannian manifolds. *J. Diff. Geom.* 3. (1969). 493-510.

[Gi] V. L. Ginzburg, The Conley Conjecture. *arXiv:math.SG/0610956v1.*

[GiGu] V. L. Ginzburg and B. Z. Gurel, Local Floer Homology and the Action Gap Authors. *arXiv:math.SG/0709.4077.*

[Hi] N. Hingston, Subharmonic solutions of Hamiltonian equations on tori. To appear in *Ann. Math.*

[Kl] W. Klingenberg, *Lectures on Closed Geodesics*, Springer-Verlag Berlin, 1978.

[Le] P. Le Calvez, Periodic orbits of Hamiltonian homeomorphisms of surfaces. *Duke Math.J*, **133**(2006), 125-184.

[LiLo] C. Liu, Y. Long, An optimal increasing estimate for Maslov-type indices of iterations. *Chinese Bull. Sci.*, **42**(1997), 2275-2277 (Chinese edition), **43**(1998), 1063-1066 (English edition).

[LoAn] Y. Long, T. An, Indexing domains of instablity for Hamilton systems. *Nonlinear Differential Equation,* **5**(1998), 461-478.

[Lo1] Y. Long, Maslov-type index, degenerate critical points, and asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems. *Sci. China Ser.* **A 33**(1990), 1409–1419.

[Lo2] Y. Long, Multiple periodic points of the Poincaré map of Lagrangian systems on tori. *Math. Z.*, **233**(2000), 443-470.

[Lo3] Y.Long, *Index Theory for Symplectic Paths with Applications.* Progress in Math. 207, Birkhäuser. Basel. 2002.

[Lo4] Y. Long, A Maslov-type index theory for Symplectic Paths. *Top. Meth. Nonl. Anal.*, **10**(1997), 47-78.

[LoLu] Y.Long; G. Lu, Infinitely many periodic solution orbits of autonomous Lagrangian systems on tori. *J. Funct. Anal.* **197**(2003), no. 2, 301–322.

[LoZZ] Y. Long; D. Zhang; C. Zhu, Multiple brake orbits in bounded convex symmetric domains. *Adv. Math.* **203** (2006), no. 2, 568–635.

[Lu1] G. Lu, On the degenerated Arnold-Givental conjecture. *arXiv:math.SG/0806.0122v1.*

[LuW1] G. Lu, M. Wang, Existence of infinitely many brake orbits of Lagrangian autonomous systems on tori. *International Mathematical Forum*, **2**(2007), no. 47, 2333-2338.

[LuW2] G. Lu, M. Wang, Infinitely many even periodic solutions of Lagrangian systems on any Riemannian tori with even potential in time. To appear in *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics.*

[Ma] W. S. Massey, *Singular Homology Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 1980.

[SaWe] D. Salamon; J. Weber, Floer homology and the heat flow. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **16**(2006), no. 5, 1050–1138

[SaZe] D. Salamon, E. Zehnder, Morse theory for periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems and the Maslov index, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **45**(1992), 1303-1360.

[Su] D. Sullivan, Differential forms and the topology of manifolds. *Manifolds—Tokyo 1973 (Proc. Internat. Conf., Tokyo, 1973), pp. 37–49. Univ. Tokyo Press, Tokyo,* 1975.

[Vi1] C. Viterbo, A new obstruction to embedding Lagrangian tori. *Invent. Math.*, **100**(1990), 301-320.

[Vi2] C. Viterbo, Symplectic real algebraic geometry, *preprint*, 1999.

[Vi3] C. Viterbo, Functors and computations in Floer cohomology II. *Preprint, 1996* (revised in 2003) available from http://www.math.polytechnique.fr/cmat/viterbo/Prepublications.html.

[Wa] Z. Q. Wang, Equivariant Morse theory for isolated critical orbits and its applications to nonlinear problems. *Lect. Notes in Math.* No. 1306, Springer, (1988) 202-221.